ISLAM AND MODERNISM

MARYAM JAMEELAH

From Nani, on my
20th birthday. Aug. '88.

ISLAM
AND
MODERNISM

BY

MARYAM JAMEELAH

Publisher

Mohammad Yusuf Khan & Sons
Sunnat Nagar, LAHORE
(Pakistan)

5th Edition February 1988 1,100

PRICE :

Printed by Metro Printers, Lahore

And whoso seeketh a way of life other than Islam, Allah will not accept it from him and he will be a loser in the Hereafter.

Quran, III: 85.

Ayesha reported that the Messenger of Allah said: "Whoever introduces a new innovation into this thing of ours (Islam) which is not of it, he is cursed."

Muslim, Bukhari.

THIS WORK IS INTENDED FOR EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN SCHOLARS OF ISLAM AND THEIR DISCIPLES IN MUSLIM LANDS

WHY I EMBRACED ISLAM

I trace the beginning of my interest in Islam when as a child of ten, while attending a reformed Jewish "Sunday School", I became fascinated with the historical relationship between the Jews and the Arabs. From my Jewish textbooks, I learned that Abraham was the father of the Arabs as well as the Jews. I read how centuries later when, in medieval Europe, Christian persecution made their lives intolerable, the Jews were welcomed in Muslim Spain and that it was the magnanimity of this same Arabic-Islamic civilization which stimulated Hebrew culture to reach its highest peak of achievement. Totally unaware of the true nature of Zionism, I naively thought that the Jews were returning to Palestine to strengthen their close ties of kinship in religion and culture with their Semitic cousins. Together I believed that the Jews and Arabs would cooperate to attain another Golden Age of culture in the Middle East.

Despite my fascination with the study of Jewish history, I was extremely unhappy at the "Sunday School." At this time I identified myself strongly with the Jewish people in Europe, then suffering a horrible fate under the Nazis and I was shocked that none of my fellow class-mates nor their parents took their religion seriously. During the services at the synagogue, the children used to read comic-strips hidden in their prayer-books and laugh to scorn at the rituals. The children were so noisy and disorderly that the teachers could not discipline them and found

it very difficult to conduct the classes. At home the atmosphere for religious observance was scarcely more congenial. My elder sister detested the "Sunday School" so much that my mother literally had to drag her out of bed in the mornings and she never went without the struggle of tears and hot words. Finally my parents were exhausted and let her quit. On the Jewish High Holy Days instead of attending synagogue and fasting on *Yom Kippur*, my sister and I were taken out of school to attend family picnics and gay parties in fine restaurants. When my sister and I convinced our parents how miserable we both were at the "Sunday School," they joined an agnostic, humanist organization known as the *Ethical Culture Movement*.

The *Ethical Culture Movement* was founded late in the 19th century by Felix Adler. While studying for the rabbinate, Felix Adler grew convinced that devotion to ethical values as relative and man-made, regarding any supernaturalism or theology as irrelevant, constituted the only religion fit for the modern world. I attended the Ethical Culture "Sunday School" each week from the age of eleven until I graduated at fifteen. Here I grew into complete accord with the ideas of the movement and regarded all traditional, organized religions with scorn.

Throughout my adolescence I remained under the influence of humanistic philosophy until, after I began to mature intellectually and atheism no longer satisfied me, I began a renewed search for my identity. For a time I joined a *Bahai* group in New York called *The Caravan of East and West* under the leadership of a Persian by the name of Mirza Ahmad Sohrab (d. 1958)

بِسْمِ اللهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ

PREFACE

The essays between these covers have been written with the fervent conviction that modern cultural values not only differ but conflict with the teachings of Islam and that any attempt to compromise the latter with the former will end in the destruction of the way of life Muslims have always cherished. The author is a recent convert of American origin who in 1961, after many years of deep thought and study, embraced Islam while still living in her native New York. Like every true Muslim, she is convinced beyond doubt that Islam alone offers the most satisfying answers to all the great questions of life, being the most comprehensive and vigorous faith which can resist and ultimately triumph over the evil of secularism and materialism.

The depth of the writer's faith in Islam is demonstrated by this one of the significant events of her life that when she grew certain that her future as a Muslim in America was hopelessly bleak, three and a half years ago, she migrated to Pakistan under the personal responsibility of Sayyid Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi where she has now taken up permanent residence at the home of her husband's family in Lahore. Her husband is the publisher of this book.

In the essays which follow, she attempts to prove that Muslims have no alternative but to reject all un-Islamic modes of life such as modernism, and strive to practise the faith exactly as the Holy Prophet and his Companions understood it, interpret the Holy Quran and Sunnah in their strict *literal* sense, cease to submit Islam to foreign criteria and abandon every trace of apologetics —Islam needs no apology.

The author has successfully argued that if the Muslims are to grow strong and vigorous, they must possess supreme confidence in the absolute superiority of their faith over man-made philosophies. They must put Islam first and all else afterwards. Truth must never be compromised with falsehood for compromise is too often the result of defeat. Muslims must be fearless in combating the forces against them and recognize them for what they are. This is no time to hedge and haw. This is no time to mince words. The truth must be spoken and fearlessly translated into action.

TUFAIL MUHAMMAD,
Ameer, Jama'at-e-Islami, West Pakistan.

ICHHRA, LAHORE
December 17, 1965

would be utter chaos leading to individual and collective ruin. Belief in the Hereafter, as the rabbis in the *Talmud* taught, argued Professor Katsh, was not mere wishful thinking but a moral necessity. Only those, he said, who firmly believed that each of us will be summoned by God on Judgment Day to render a complete account of our life on earth and rewarded or punished accordingly, will possess the self-discipline to sacrifice transitory pleasures and endure hardships and sacrifice to attain lasting good. While Professor Katsh was lecturing thus, I was comparing in my mind what I had read in the Old Testament and the *Talmud* with what was taught in the Quran and Hadith and finding Judaism so defective, I was converted to Islam.

Although I wanted to become a Muslim as far back as 1954, my family managed to argue me out of it. I was warned that Islam would complicate my life because it is not, like Judaism and Christianity, part of the American scene. I was told that Islam would alienate me from my family and isolate me from the community. At that time my faith was not sufficiently strong to withstand these pressures. Partly as the result of this inner turmoil, I became so ill that I had to discontinue college long before it was time for me to graduate so that I never earned any diploma. For the next two years I remained at home under private medical care, steadily growing worse. In desperation from 1957-1959, my parents confined me both to private and public hospitals where I vowed that if ever I recovered sufficiently to be discharged, I would embrace Islam.

After I was allowed to return home, I investigated

who told me that he had been the secretary of Abdul Baha, one of the founders of the *Bahai*. Initially I was attracted to the *Bahai* because of its Islamic origin and its preaching about the oneness of mankind, but when I discovered how miserably they had failed to implement this ideal, I left them a year later, bitterly disillusioned. When I was eighteen years old, I became a member of the local branch of the religious Zionist youth movement known as the *Mizrachi Hatzair*, but when I found out what the real nature of Zionism was, which made the hostility between Jews and Arabs irreconcilable, I left several months later in disgust. When I was twenty and a student at *New York University*, one of my elective courses was entitled "Judaism in Islam." My professor, Rabbi Abraham Isaac Katsh, the head of the Department of Hebrew Studies there, spared no efforts to convince his students —all Jews many of whom aspired to become rabbis— that Islam was derived from Judaism. Our textbook, written by him,* took each verse from the Quran, painstakingly tracing it to its allegedly Jewish source. Although his real aim was to prove to his students the superiority of Judaism over Islam, he convinced me diametrically of the opposite. I was repelled by the subordination of the Hereafter, so vividly portrayed in the Holy Quran, to the alleged Divine right of the Jews to Palestine. The Jewish God in the Old Testament and in the Jewish prayer-book appeared to me distorted and degraded into some kind of real-estate

***Judaism in Islam*, Washington Square Press, New York, 1954; reprinted under the new title, *Judaism and the Koran*, A. S. Barnes and Company, New York, 1962.

who told me that he had been the secretary of Abdul Baha, one of the founders of the *Bahai*. Initially I was attracted to the *Bahai* because of its Islamic origin and its preaching about the oneness of mankind, but when I discovered how miserably they had failed to implement this ideal, I left them a year later, bitterly disillusioned. When I was eighteen years old, I became a member of the local branch of the religious Zionist youth movement known as the *Mizrachi Hatzair*, but when I found out what the real nature of Zionism was, which made the hostility between Jews and Arabs irreconcilable, I left several months later in disgust. When I was twenty and a student at *New York University*, one of my elective courses was entitled "Judaism in Islam." My professor, Rabbi Abraham Isaac Katsh, the head of the Department of Hebrew Studies there, spared no efforts to convince his students —all Jews many of whom aspired to become rabbis— that Islam was derived from Judaism. Our textbook, written by him,* took each verse from the Quran, painstakingly tracing it to its allegedly Jewish source. Although his real aim was to prove to his students the superiority of Judaism over Islam, he convinced me diametrically of the opposite. I was repelled by the subordination of the Hereafter, so vividly portrayed in the Holy Quran, to the alleged Divine right of the Jews to Palestine. The Jewish God in the Old Testament and in the Jewish prayer-book appeared to me distorted and degraded into some kind of real-estate

**Judaism in Islam*, Washington Square Press, New York, 1954; reprinted under the new title, *Judaism and the Koran*, A. S. Barnes and Company, New York, 1962.

agent! The fusion of parochial nationalism with religion, I thought, had spiritually impoverished Judaism beyond redemption. The rigid exclusiveness of Judaism I felt had a great deal of connection with the persecutions the Jews have suffered throughout their history. I reflected that perhaps these tragedies would not have happened if the Jews had competed vigorously with other faiths for converts. I soon discovered that Zionism was merely a combination of the racist, tribalistic aspects of Judaism with modern secular nationalism. Zionism was further discredited in my eyes when I learned that few, if any, of the leaders of Zionism were observant Jews and that perhaps nowhere is orthodox, traditional Judaism regaded with such intense contempt as in "Israel." When I found nearly all important Jewish leaders in America uncritical supporters for Zionism who felt not the slightest twinge of conscience because of the terrible injustice inflicted upon the Palestinian Arabs, I could no longer consider myself a Jew at heart.

One morning in November 1954, Professor Katsh, during his lecture, argued with irrefutable logic that the monotheism taught by Moses (peace be upon him) and the Divine Laws revealed to him at Sinai were indispensable as the basis for all higher ethical values. If morals were purely man-made, as the *Ethical Culture* and other agnostic and atheistic phi osophies taught,* then they could be changed at will, according to mere whim, convenience or circumstance. The result

*See *Ethical Religion*, David Muzzey, American Ethical Union, New York, 1952; and *Religion Without Revelation*, Julian Huxley, New American Library, New York, 1956.

CONTENTS

was a vivid experience. Even at that early age, Iknew that such a watered-down, half-hearted compromise could never hope to retain the loyalty of its members, much less their children. How dismayed I was when I found among the Muslims, the same threat! How shocked I was when I found certain scholars and political leaders within the Muslim community guilty of the identical sins for which God in our Holy Quran has so vehemently denounced the Jews! Convinced that God would not spare us from calamity and doom us to the same fate the Jews have suffered unless we sincerely repented and changed our ways, I vowed that I would devote all my literary struggle to combating this menace from within before it was too late.

Thus, in his first letter to me of January 1961, Maulana Maudoodi wrote: "While I was scanning your essays, I felt as if I were reading my very own ideas. I hope your feeling will be the same when you have the opportunity to learn Urdu and study my books. And that, despite the fact there has been no previous acquaintance between you and me, this mutual sympathy and unanimity in thought has resulted directly from the fact that both of us have derived our inspiration from one and the same source —Islam !"

MARYAM JAMEELAH
(*formerly Margaret Marcus*)

THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOURCES OF WESTERN MATERIALISM

THE society of ancient Greece was the earliest in history to divorce its institutions, customs, arts and sciences from religion. In other words, ancient Greece was the first truly secular society. Its philosophy was based on the premise that a perfect, harmonious society filled with beauty and justice could be achieved by an intelligent, rational application of human reason unaided by any supernatural power. This secular ideal has remained the dominant theme of Western civilization to this day.

According to the ancient Greeks, beauty reached its epitome of perfection in the naked human body. The naked human body, both male and female, was the dominant theme of Greek art which sculptors and painters reproduced endlessly. In order to promote maximum physical development, the utmost encouragement of sports and games was deemed essential. No city or town of any importance lacked its public gymnasiums for the training of athletes. Regular athletic contests, held allegedly in honor of the gods, took place in vast elaborate stadiums, each capable of seating thousands of spectators. It was customary for the participating athletes to perform stark naked. The most important of these contests were the "Olympic Games" which still continue.

The following quotation is taken from Plato's (427-347 B.C.) celebrated *Republic* which through

the mouth of his teacher, Socrates (469-399 B.C.), he attempted to expound the utopia of the most ideal city-state:

"Thus Socrates", asked Glaucon, "do you think the females of the guardian dogs ought to share in the guard which the males keep? Ought they to join in the hunt and whatever else they do? Or should the females keep kennel indoors because of the birth and training of pups and should the males do the hard work and have all the care of the flocks?"

"They ought to do everything together," answered Socrates, "except that we treat the males as stronger and the females as weaker."

"But, is it possible to use animals for the same things if you do not give them the same training and education?"

"Impossible."

"Now music and gymnastic are taught to the men. So we must teach the women these same two arts in matters of war and use them in the same way. Surely we see naked women in the wrestling schools exercising with the men—not only the young women but even the older ones. Like the old men in the gymnasium covered with wrinkles and not pleasant to look at who still fancy the game!"

"But we have found by experience that it is better to strip than to hide all such things and soon the seemingly funny to the eyes melted away before that which was revealed in the light of reason to be the best . . . These women are to be common to all these men; nobody must have a private wife of his own and the children must be common, too; the parent shall not know the child nor the child its parent."

"I see in your house hunting dogs and game birds. Pray, have you paid any attention to their matings and breedings?"

"It follows that from what we have agreed that the best

men must mingle most often with the best women and only the children of the best must be brought up—not the others—if the flock is to be tiptop. And none must know of this infanticide going on except the rulers alone. Often rulers will have to use falsehood and deceit for the benefit of the ruled and, as we have mentioned previously, all such things are useful as a kind of drug . . . . If a defective child is born, it must be disposed of on the understanding that there is no food or nurture for that one."

The secular heritage of Greece was adopted, cherished and perpetuated by pagan Rome. However, because the Romans were, above all, militarily-minded, the worship of beauty was rapidly replaced by the worship of force. The intense idealism of the Greeks soon deteriorated into an ever-growing cynicism and skepticism. Thus the Roman philosopher, Maximus of Tyre, set forth the following arguments for atheism:

> The Eternal has His intentions from all Eternity. If prayer accords with His immutable wishes, it is quite useless to ask of Him what He has resolved to do. If one prays to Him to do the contrary of what He has resolved, it is praying that He be weak, frivolous, inconsistent; it is believing that He is all these things; it is to mock Him. Either you ask Him a just thing in which case He must do it and the thing will be done without your praying to Him —entreating Him is even to distrust Him—or the thing is unjust in which case you insult Him. You are worthy or unworthy of the grace you implore. If worthy, He knows it better than you; if unworthy, you commit one more sin by asking for what you do not deserve. In a word, we pray to God only because we have made Him in our own image! quoted from *The Portable Voltaire*, Viking Press, New York, 1949.

In the thousand-year interval between the fall of the Roman Empire and the rise of the Renaissance, the

Roman Catholic Church reigned supreme. Throughout this period, popularly known as "The Middle Ages," Europe's historical continuity with ancient Greece and Rome was broken. The Middle Ages in fact constituted no less than a distinct, unique civilization all its own. It had no features whatever in common either with ancient Greek or Roman society or Europe as it exists today. In fact, the civilization of the Middle Ages could be called "Western" only by virtue of its geographical location.

The civilization of the Middle Ages was in every respect hostile and contradictory to that of modern times. This is why no period of European history has been more unfairly maligned. This is also the reason why no word in the English language has acquired more derogatory connotations than "medieval". Whenever an American or European confronts this adjective, his imagination immediately conjures up the "Dark Ages" of barbarism, feudalism, ignorance and superstition. Whenever a Westerner wishes to describe any part of the world he regards as particularly backward, he labels it as "medieval".

The Renaissance coincided with the rejection of Christianity by the leading intellectuals of Europe combined with their uncritical adoration of ancient Greece and Rome. The Renaissance really meant the revival and renewal of paganism. Thus Western civilization reverted to its original theme, continuing its development ever since, accordingly.

One of the dominant personalities of the Renaissance who epitomized its spirit was Nicolo Machiavelli (1469-1532). A native of Florence, Italy, he achieved

a prominent position in its government. During his thirteen years of service, his mind became more and more preoccupied with the inferiority of Italy's political organization and military strength in comparison with neighbouring Spain and France. As a result of war with France, Machievelli was ousted from his post and exiled. While in exile he composed perhaps the most influential book ever written on the techniques of acquiring, consolidating and expanding political power—*The Prince*. Machiavelli was, above all, a devotee of nationalism and patriotism. His dream was a unified Italy as the dominant world power. Machiavelli was the father of the modern totalitarian state. He regarded power as a supreme end in itself.

> I know that everyone will admit that it would be highly pariseworthy in a prince to possess all the qualities that are reputed good but as they cannot all be possessed or observed, human conditions not permitting it, it is necessary that he should be prudent enough to avoid the scandal of those vices which would lose him the state for if one considers well, it will be found that some things which seem virtues would, if followed, lead, to one's ruin and some others which appear vices, result in one's greater security and well-being.
>
> How laudable it is for a prince to keep good faith and live with integrity and not with astuteness, everyone knows. Still the experience of our times shows those princes who have done great things have had little regard for good faith and have been able by astuteness to confuse men's brains and who have ultimately overcome those who have made loyalty their foundation.
>
> A prince being thus obliged to know well how to act as a beast, must imitate the fox and the lion for the lion cannot protect himself from traps and the fox cannot defend

himself from wolves. One must therefore be a fox to recognize traps and a lion to frighten wolves. Those who wish to be only lions do not understand this. Therefore a prudent ruler ought not to keep faith when by so doing, it would be against his interest and when the reasons which made him bind himself no longer exist. If all men were good, this precept would not be a good one, but as they are bad and would not observe their faith with you, so you are not bound to keep faith with them. Of this, one could furnish an infinite number of modern examples to demonstrate how many times peace has been broken and how many promises rendered worthless by the faithlessness of princes and those who have been able to imitate the fox have succeeded best. But it is necessary to disguise this character well and to be a great feigner and dissembler; men are so simple and so ready to obey present necessities that one who deceives will always find those who allow themselves to be deceived.

A prince must take great care that nothing goes out of his mouth which is not full of mercy, faith, humanity, sincerity and religious faith .. And nothing is more necessary than to seem to have this last quality for men in general judge more by the eyes than by the hands, for everyone can see but very few have to feel. Everybody sees what you appear to be; few feel what you are and those few will not dare to expose themselves to the many who have the majesty of the state to defend them and in the actions of men and especially of princes from whom there is no appeal, *the end justifies the means.*

The Protestant Reformation dealt the Church such a crippling blow, Christendom never recovered afterwards. Not content to rectify the abuses of Church power and corruption, Martin Luther broke with it completely and decided to create a new religion of his own. The rejection by the Protestant leaders of the

authority of the Pope and the Latin language greatly strengthened the cause of secular nationalism. In place of a strong, united Christendom were now a multiplicity of small, weak sects, each a rival of the other with its own narrow, parochial outlook. In Protestant countries a separate national church was organized under the control of the Government until everywhere in Europe, the spiritual power of religion became subordinate to the interests of secular politics.

Shortly after the Protestant Reformation, the scholars of the Renaissance discovered the most powerful of all weapons in their arsenal against the Church—science!

Francis Bacon (1561-1625) epitomized the scientific spirit of the modern age in *The New Atlantis*. An English ship lands upon a utopian island in the remote Pacific whose chief pride is a great institution devoted to scientific research. The ruler conducts the travellers through this place saying, "The end of our Foundation is the knowledge of cause and the secret motions of things and the enlarging the bounds of the human empire to the effecting of all things possible."

Descartes (1956-1650) carried on the development of the experimental method where Francis Bacon had begun, completely overthrowing the authority of Aristotle and the medieval scholastic philosophers, in order to discover new truth instead of merely proving what was already known. To Western philosophers, like Descartes, nature was nothing more than a machine which had no spiritual significance. All living things, including man, were a mere matter of automatic chemical reactions. "Give me the elements," boasted

Descartes, "and I will construct the universe!"

Intoxicated by the theory advanced by Newton (1643-1727) that the entire universe was regulated by immutable mathematical laws, the protagonists of the so-called "Age of Enlightenment" taught that all beliefs contrary to human experience and observation must be discarded. Miracles, prophecy, revelation as well as all religious rites and ceremonies were ridiculed as superstition. Voltaire (1694-1778) said that God created the Universe as a watch-maker assembles a watch, afterwards having no future concern with it. Hume (1711-1776) rejected all religious beliefs on the ground that they could not be proved either by scientific experiment or human reason. He attacked even the deist god of Voltaire declaring that we have seen watches made but not worlds. If the universe did have an author, he may have been an incompetent workman or he may have long since died after completing his work or he may have been a male or female god or a great number of gods. He may have been entirely good or entirely evil or both or neither, probably the last. Hume's argument against the existence of the Hereafter ran as follows: We have no reason for concluding from a life where rewards and punishments fail to coincide with human deserts that there will be any subsequent life in which they do.

Morality was regarded as a science like mathematics, as independent from theology as any other branch of human knowledge. Philosophers such as Dideroit and Rousseau all agreed that utility and happiness were the sole criterions for morality. Man should seek as much pleasure and happiness as he

can in this life without depriving his fellows of their rightful share. Whatever relations give pleasure to all concerned cannot but be beneficial. Consequently they saw no good in the traditional demands for chastity between the sexes.

Having destroyed what they considered the foolish errors of the past, the apostles of the Enlightenment believed that reason and science, spread by universal mass education, would usher in a virtual paradise on earth. Now that man possessed the magic of science, it was within his power to shape his own destiny. Liberty, social and economic equality and universal peace would reign over the entire world. Ever-expanding knowledge would forever banish all disease and suffering leading to an indefinite prolongation of human life. The technological and scientific revolutions of the following century served to confirm this new faith in the perfectibility of human life on this earth without the aid of any supernatural power.

Darwin's (1809-1882) concept of the evolution of man from lower forms of life introduced an entirely new scale of ethical values. Philosophers now conceived of human society in a constant state of flux and change inevitably leading to higher and more complex stages of development. The principle of biological evolution, applied to human society, identified the "modern", "up-to-date", "advanced", and "progressive" with what was most desirable. Historians came to look upon man as a product as well as a part of nature evolving to his present state from lowly origins with all his achievements having been painfully acquired in the struggle against a hostile environment. Darwin con-

vinced Western philosophers that man was an animal species like any other—a higher mammal to be sure, but only an animal. William James (1842-1910) even questioned the value of retaining the intangible concept of consciousness or mind at all, regarding human thought as merely the end result of chemical reactions upon the nervous system produced by external stimuli. Psychologists like Pavlov (1849-1936) sought to delve into the motives of human behaviour by studying dogs, monkeys and apes.

Freud's (1859-1939) discovery of the compulsive drives of the unconscious mind originating in early childhood as the source of all irrational behavior provided modern philosophers with yet an additional weapon against religion. Freud maintained that the small child projected the image of his parents who gave him life, protected him from harm and subjected him to discipline, punishment and rewards on to his religious life in adulthood. The concept that religion is purely man-made and that ethics are relative and not absolute was enthusiastically welcomed by students of history, sociology and anthropology. Thus Ralph Linton, a distinguished American anthropologist, in his study of the cultures of mankind, *The Tree of Culture* (1953), argued that the uncompromising monotheism of Judaism and Islam originated in the rigidly patriarchal family life of the Semitic tribes of Arabia. He writes:

> The concept of an all-powerful deity who can only be placated by complete submission and devotion, no matter how unjust His acts may appear, was the direct outgrowth of Semitic family life. Another product of the exaggerated

super-ego to which it gave rise was the elaborate system of taboos relating to every aspect of behaviour which were epitomized in the Law of Moses. Such codes of taboos provided those who kept them with a sense of security comparable to that of the good child who is able to remember everything his father told him to do. God is the portrait of the typical Semitic father with his patriarchal, authoritarian qualities abstracted and exaggerated.

Freud, not content to deny the divine origin of religion, rejected the idea that religious faith was justified on any grounds.

It seems not to be true that there is a Power in the universe which watches over the well-being of every individual with parental care, bringing all within His fold to a happy ending. On the contrary, the destinies of men are incompatible with any universal principle of justice. Eathquakes, floods and fires do not distinguish between the good and devout man and the sinner and unbeliever. Even if we leave inanimate nature out of account and consider only the destinies of individual men in so far as they depend on their relations with others of their own kind, it is by no means the rule that virtue is rewarded and wickedness punished. It often happens that the violent, crafty and unprincipled seize the desirable goods of this world while the pious go away empty. Dark, unfeeling and unloving powers determine human destiny; the concept of Divine justice, which, according to religion rules the world, seems to have no existence. No attempt to minimize the supremacy of science can alter the fact that it takes into account our dependence on the real, external world while religion is only a childish illusion deriving its strength from the fact that it happens to fall in with our instinctual desires.—*Freud: Great Thinkers of the Western World, Encyclopedia Britannica.*

Materialistic philosophy reached its climax in its chief protagonist—Karl Marx. According to Karl

Marx, all aspects of human history, society and culture are the result of economic factors, the individual being nothing more than a product of his immediate surroundings and that through a progressive improvement in the material environment, a perfect society will inevitably emerge. Marxist dogma is responsible to a very great extent for Western civilization as it is today. It has found as enthusiastic acceptance in America as the Soviet Union, the main difference being that while the latter is honest in the pursuit of its goal, the former is subtle and hypocritical.

Bertrand Russell develops materialistic philosophy to its furthest extent when he writes:

> That man is the product of causes which had no provision of the end they were achieving, that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and beliefs are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms, that no amount of heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling can preserve the individual life beyond the grave, that all the labour of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration of human genius are destined for extinction in the vast death of the solar system and that the whole temple of man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins—all these things are so nearly certain that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand. Only within the scaffold of these truths, only on the firm foundation of unyielding despair, can man's habitation be safely built.
>
> —*Makers of the Modern Mind*, Randall, Columbia University Press, New York 1930.

Schopenhauer carried materialistic philosophy to its logical conclusion. For him the essence of life is an aimless, restless activity, an utterly irrational force.

> Since the basis of all desire is need, deficiency and thus pain, the nature of brute and man alike is originally and of its very essence subject to pain. If, on the other hand, it achieves its objects of desire through too easy satisfaction, such void and ennui fills the heart that existence becomes an unbearable burden. Thus life swings like a pendulum from pain to ennui, from ennui to pain. Life is a sea full of rocks and whirlpools which man avoids with the greatest care and solicitude although he knows that even with all his efforts and skill he succeeds in getting through, he comes thus but the nearer at every task to the greatest, the total inevitable shipwreck—death. Every human being and his course of life is but another short dream of the endless spirit of nature. The persistent will to live is only another fleeting form which nature carelessly sketches in its infinite pages, allows to remain for a time so short it vanishes into nothing and then obliterates to make room for others.—*Makers of the Modern Mind*, op. cit.

After denying any positive value to religious faith, Freud had to admit that science is no substitute:

> Science, apart from its emphasis on the real world, has essentially negative characteristics in that it limits itself to tangible material truth and rejects illusions. Some of our follow men who are dissatisfied with this state of affairs and desire something more for their momentary peace of mind, may look for it where they can find it, but we cannot help them.—*Encyclopedia Britannica*, op. cit.

"The present misery of life—hunger, pain, age, death and strife—accentuated by the two World Wars, or perhaps only felt more keenly than before—has often been the theme of the polemic against God with the materialist thinkers, including poets and novelists. They have challenged His mercy and asked the theolo-

gian not to insult human reason by the mockery of promised payment for every tear shed in this life, for paper currency without the assurance of convertibility into cash on demand is a fraud. At the root of this harangue lies the disbelief in the immortality of life. If we fail now, we fail forever, for there is no 'ever' to come after. If we lose this life, we lose all, for this is the first and the last chance. Hopes and aspirations, dangers and fears, plans and efforts come to an abrupt end the moment death intervenes. With this limited view of life, it is but natural that our sufferings here should count for so much, and give us a just grievance against the injustice of Providence, making us forget that the inequities we resent are mostly of our own making."

"And the inequities shall probably never totally vanish. They have come to stay. God holds out no promise to endow every man with the health of a Mohammad Ali (Clay), with the riches of a Rockefeller or with the intellectualism of a Bertrand Russell. He has as yet announced no scheme of universal insurance against want and indigence, disease and old age. The Utopian future with perfect facility of body and mind dealt to every individual in fullest measure is a dream. The scientists may promise us that before this century draws to a close, every one of us shall be revelling in the comforts of air-conditioned houses and automobiles, not knowing how to perspire under a hot sun or shiver on a cold night. The meanest of us shall have work made easy and pleasant and abundantly paying, and at the same time plenty of leisure to enjoy

the art and culture of the age. Should such a dream come true, it would be an unlucky day for humanity."

"We are here to work, to strive, to share the woes and worries of our fellowmen and make our contributions to the betterment of the world, to establish spiritual peace and not mere bodily ease and to root out tyranny and injustice, jealousy and hatred—a tremendous task and a task that we may perhaps leave unaccomplished. But that does not matter. We are more concerned with what we personally gain by the strife in the eyes of God; the rest is the concern of God Himself. It is only in such a world of hope and effort that we should want to live, work and die."*

*—S. Ahmad, "Back to God-V," *Yaqeen International*, Karachi, April 22, 1967.

MODERN PHILOSOPHY: ITS CHARACTERISTICS AND CONSEQUENCES

Modernism is a militant revolt against religion and all the spiritual values it represents. This revolt had its seeds in the European Renaissance, especially in the unscrupulous political philosophy of Machiavelli. It burst into full bloom in the 18th century French philosophers of the "Enlightenment" and culminated in 19th century Europe with Darwin, Marx and Freud. From its birth-place in Western Europe, this malignant cancer has invaded virtually every country in the world destroying the indigenous cultures of Asia. Indeed, it is hardly an exaggeration to claim that modernism has become the prevailing universal faith. All who embrace this creed are eulogized as enlightened and progressive while those who are reluctant are stigmatized as backward, medieval and reactionary. It is for this reason that the leaders of Asia and Africa, after attaining political freedom, so often become even more fanatical in their devotion to modernism than their former colonial masters.

Modernism appears under the guise of many different labels—Communism, Socialism, Capitalism, Pragmatism, Positivism, Fascism, Nazism, Zionism, Kemalism and Arab nationalism. A careful examination, however, will reveal all these modern ideologies, despite their mutual rivalries and hatreds, to be merely different branches of the same tree.

A cardinal dogma of modernism is its *repudiation*

of the Hereafter. Rejection of the Hereafter inevitably leads to the conclusion that bodily comfort, material prosperity, worldly success and personal happiness are the only worthwhile goals in life. It deals a death-blow to morality by denying man's accountability for his deeds to God and destroying his faith that justice must ultimately prevail.

All modernist ideologies are characterized by man-worship. Man-worship most often appears under the guise of science. Modernists are convinced that progress in scientific knowledge will eventually confer upon them all the powers of Divinity. Another common form of man-worship is nationalism. Nationalism is characterized by the collective worship of one's own particular group combined with hatred of foreigners and minorities. Witness the persecution of the Jews in Nazi Germany, the Arabs in Israel, the Muslims of India and, most recently, the Turks in Cyprus. Nationalism demands supreme allegiance to the all-powerful secular state. Political leaders are deified. Their pictures and statues are displayed in public everywhere. Nazi soldiers used to wear Hitler's photo on their bosoms and if they were injured and breathed their last in hospitals, they were found kissing these pictures and placing them on their eyes. In Russia, Lenin's dead body has been specially preserved for four and a half decades in a sealed glass case. His tomb in Moscow's Red Square is the national shrine, so much so that people are willing to stand in line for many hours in winter just for a glimpse of it. Visitors to Lenin's tomb find the atmosphere there akin to what

may be experienced by worshippers in a church. After Stalin died, his body was embalmed in the same manner and placed under glass beside Lenin's until Khrushchev denounced him and it was taken away simultaneously with the swift removal of all his portraits and statues from conspicuous places. Under Communist rule in China, Mao Tse-Tung is to all intents and purposes worshipped as a god and the rising generation has been educated to revere his writings as their holy scriptures.

> Be it a railway compartment, a public bus, a restaurant, a street corner, a roadside pavement, a passenger's waiting lounge at an airport or even an airplane flying up in the sky—the Red Guards are invariably there, singing, reciting and dancing their Mao's thought. In the Chinese airways commercial services, as soon as toffees, tea and cigarettes have been served and as soon as the "Fasten seat belts," is switched off, the young hostesses stand in a row and take out their copies of the 'red book' containing selected passages from Mao Tse-Tung's writings. The passengers follow suit. Then they read in chorus some pages of the book. This solemn ritual being over, the air-hostesses take out a small, dainty drum and they sing and dance to the glory of China till it is time to land at the next airport. This is a ritual which goes on interminably in every sphere of activity throughout the length and breadth of China.
>
> "Cultural Revolution: China's New Generation Taking Over," Qudrat Ullah Shahab,—*The Pakistan Times*, Lahore October 1, 1967.

Without exception, all modernist ideologies reject transcendental values. In other words, there is no such thing as any objective, absolute criterion for truth. Rather, truth and moral values are only relative and

their validity limited to time, place and circumstance. Societies based upon Divine revelation are dubbed by the modernists as "static" and "petrified." Mere change is considered a virtue for its own sake and the faster things change, the better. The supreme virtue of modernism is to be "up-to-date." Newness, whether it be the latest fashion in women's dress, the latest model car or the latest dance craze is prized above all else.

Another major goal of modernist ideology is to weaken family ties and home life as much as possible. Indeed, Karl Marx in his *Communist Manifesto* (1848) advocated the elimination of the family entirely. This goal has, of course, been most successfully achieved in Soviet Russia and Communist China. In non-Communist countries the process is more subtle but no less effective. The major weapons employed against the family are: (1) industrialization, (2) urbanization, (3) the "emancipation" of women. Actually all three operate simultaneously and go hand in hand. Modern industrialization with its promise of high wages and other material benefits lures large numbers of the able-bodied from the close-knit, well-integrated society of the rural village to the anonymity of the large city. In the process, families are often broken up and separated. With industrialization, the family ceases to be a self-sufficient economic unit. As a result, the father spends most of his time away from home and the mother, bored by housekeeping which mechanization has robbed of creativity or interest, also seeks outside diversions. Although nurseries, kindergartens

and schools increasingly assume a parental role, large numbers of children are left to their own devices and roam the streets almost completely unsupervised. Under such circumstances, it is no mystery why juvenile delinquency has become epidemic.

> The adolescents of our time are hoisting distress signals. They want the rest of us to know they are in trouble. The main trends of juvenile disturbance may be specified as follows: (1) a tendency to antisocial behavior as expressed particularly in acts of unprecedented violence; (2) a revolution in sexual mores shown in a tendency to promiscuity and perversion; (3) a wave of contagion that makes an obsession of everything "hot"—hot jazz, hot dancing, hot rods—a compulsive quest for every new kind of "kick;" (4) a leaning toward over-conformity with family or with the peer group; closely associated, a trend toward static-mindedness, a loss of adventure, a loss of creative spark; (5) a tendency towards withdrawal, toward a loss of hope and faith, toward disillusionment and dispair with progressive destruction of ideals; (6) a failure on the part of the adolescent to harmonize his goals with those of family and society, a trend toward disorientation, confusion, and fragmentation of personal identity; finally, as a result of aggravated disorders of social adaptation, an increasing vulnerability of the adolescent to emotional breakdown (mental illness).
>
> "Adolescent Struggle as Protest," Nathan W. Ackerman, *The Voice of America Forum Lectures: The Family Series* No. 6, The Voice of America, Washington, D.C., 1964, p. 2.

There is no doubt that the "emancipation" of women has proved the most powerful and indispensable weapon of all. Every effort is made to lure women away from the home by making the role of housewife and mother as unattractive, unsatisfying and

unrewarding as possible. This is accomplished by subtle propaganda of the mass-media belittling the traditional feminine role and glamorizing those women who compete in careers with men. The wife who achieves economic independence from her husband destroys his role as head of the family. Consequently in families where the mother dominates, the children lose all respect for the father.

Most devastating, however, is the ever-increasing freedom for illicit sex. No effort is spared to exploit and commercialize the female body. The results can be seen in the rapidly increasing number of pregnant brides, illegitimate children, abortions, divorces, sex crimes and cases of venereal disease. In those countries dominated by modernism, polygamy is regarded as an unpardonable crime deserving of the most severe punishment whereas legal penalties are rarely enforced against illicit sex which is regarded as a purely private, individual affair!

Closely related to modernism's lack of regard for the value of the family is its *contempt for the aged.* In countries dominated by totalitarian nationalism, the glorification of youth is continually emphasized in special youth festivals, sports events, military parades and political demonstrations. In America and Western Europe, the worship of youth finds its expression in beauty contests, and the constant emphasis on sexual attractiveness in the mass media. In all countries—whether Communist or non-Communist—wherever modernism dominates, the social status of old people is extremely low. Conflict between generations is fostered

by educating young people to regard their elders as hopelessly old-fashioned and out-of-date.

Modern young adults consider freedom from any responsibility towards their elders essential for their personal happiness. Those who do care for their aged parents regard it as an intolerable burden. Eventually the sick and infirm old people end their days in nursing homes or mental hospitals regarded as useless and a social liability. It is not surprising why older people are ashamed of their age and try their utmost to preserve a youthful appearance as long as they can. Fantastic sums of money are wasted every year in America by women on hair dyes, cosmetics and reducing fads. Women of fifty are supposed to feel guilty that they do not have the figure of a girl of twenty.

> The adults today fear being cheated of the good things of life. They have a horror of aging and death. They hang on by their teeth to the superficial signs of youthfulness. They move heaven and earth to preserve their outer appearance, to keep looking young and attractive. They are obsessed with clothes, dieting, cosmetics. They carry this obsession to an almost grotesque degree as manifested, for example, in the woman's need to spend hours making up, in the dyeing of her hair, wearing wigs, face-lifting, etc. The accent on youthful appearance at all costs proceeds to such an extreme that in the relations between mother and daughter, the daughter cries out in vigorous protest, "I want my mother to look like my mother, not like my sister!" . . . The qualities of immaturity extend far into adulthood and even into middle-age. One discerns unmistakably the residue of (adolescence) in the exorbitant emotional demands, the clinging to unreal, romantic yearnings, the

evasion of responsibility, the extremes of dependency and explosive impulsivity, the frantic indulgence in diversions and escape, the divided self, the inordinate leaning on facade, the outer face of personality, the unreadiness for adult commitment to work and loyalty to family . . . The world is felt to be a jungle; it is each man for himself. With such opportunism, people become alienated, mechanized and lose their human quality . . . Family relations are measured by indices of profit and loss as in the business world . . . Money and position are God. People come to be treated as things. Human relations become in fact dehumanized . . . At another level there is the tendency to substitute the appearance for the real thing . . . It is not who you are but how you look. Everything in human intercourse is reduced to dress and cosmetics . . . The goals of power and mastery assume an overweaning importance; they submerge the family ideals of love, unity, loyalty, sharing and cooperation.

Adolescent Struggle as Protest, Nathan W. Ackerman, op. cit. pp. 8-9.

One of the greatest defects of modernism is its inability ta take a comprehensive view of human life. For instance, Freudian ideology claimed that human health and happiness depends upon an uninhibited sex-life while Marx was convinced that economics was the center of existence. This extreme compartmentalism is common to all modernist philosophy. A single aspect of human life, such as sex or economics, is taken out of its proper context and its importance exaggerated beyond all reasonable bounds. In other words, the part is mistaken for the whole.

The evil of Western civilization is not incidental or merely caused by human weakness which fails to live up to "noble principles". The "noble principles"

themselves are lacking. Western civilization is evil in theory as well as in practice. This evil is a basic and integral part of its guiding philosophy and corrupts the whole structure. One may well object and insist that Western civilization has achieved greatness in many fields. However, it must be remembered that falsehood always parades itself under the guise of truth. That is why it seldom, if ever, appears totally black.

CULTURAL SLAVERY IS INSEPARABLE FROM POLITICAL SLAVERY

Although there is no doubt that from the standpoint of our faith in Islam and the survival of our unique identity as a people, cultural slavery on principle is indeed far more harmful than mere foreign political domination, yet in practice, cultural slavery is not only intimately linked to political slavery but, to all intents and purposes, they are virtually inseparable. Nearly six centuries ago, the brilliant Muslim historian Ibn Khaldun recognized this fact when he wrote in his *Muqaddimah*:

> The vanquished always seek to imitate their victors in their dress, insignia, belief and other customs and usages. This is because men are always inclined to attribute perfection to those who have defeated and subjugated them. Men do this either because the reverence they feel for their conquerors makes them see perfection in them or because they refuse to admit that their defeat could have been brought about by ordinary causes and hence they suppose that it is due to the perfection of the conquerors. Should this belief persist long, it will change into a profound conviction and will lead to the adoption of all the tenets of the victors and the imitation of all their characteristics. This belief may come about either unconsciously or because of a mistaken idea that the victory of the conquerors was due not to their superior physical solidarity and strength but to the inferiority of the customs and beliefs of the conquered. Hence arises the further belief that such an imitation will remove the causes of defeat. Therefore we see the defeated always imitating the victors in their way of dressing, of

> carrying their arms, in their equipment and in all their mode of living. . . . In fact every country which has powerful conquering neighbours tends to a large extent to imitate those neighbours as we see among the Spanish Muslims today in respect to their Christian neighbours. For the Muslims imitate the Christians in their dress and ornaments and indeed in many of their customs and institutions even to the extent of having statues and pictures on the walls of their houses and shops. And in this, the careful observer will mark a sign of inferiority. . . . .
>
> *An Arab Philosophy of History : Selections from the Muqaddimah of Ibn Khaldun of Tunis* (1332-1406), compiled and translated by Charles Issawi, John Murray, London, 1950, pp. 53-54.

True to the genius that he was, Ibn Khaldun shows his profound insight into the psychology of human nature which applies as much to us here in Pakistan now as it did to the Spanish Muslims of his day. However, it must never be forgotten that our blind and uncritical imitation of foreign civilization is far from spontaneous. From the very beginning of their rule our foreign masters had very carefully mapped out a conspiracy to destroy every manifestation of our indigenous way of life and replace it with their own.

About a hundred years ago, the British Government appointed Dr. William Hunter to write a report on the condition of the Muslims of the subcontinent and suggest specific measures as to how they could be ruled most effectively. Accordingly in 1871 he wrote: *Our Indian Musalmans: Are They Bound in Conscience to Rebel Against The Queen?* In order to break the spirit of resistance of the Muslims and make them resigned to accept foreign subjection indefinitely,

the panacea Dr. Hunter proposed was English education. Thus in the concluding pages of his book, he advised his Government:

> We should thus at length have the Muhammadan youth educated according to our own plan. Without interfering in any way with their religion and in the very process of enabling them to learn their religious duties, we should render that religion, perhaps less sincere, but certainly less fanatical. The rising generation of Muhammadans would then tread the steps which have conducted the Hindus, not long ago the most bigoted nation on earth, into their present state of easy tolerance. Such a tolerance (to modern Western civilization) implies a less earnest belief than their fathers had but it has freed them, as it would liberate the Musalmans from the cruelties which they endured in the name of their mistaken religion..... It is more than doubtful whether the Muhammadan law should be taught as a regular study incumbent on all. It certainly should not be made the chief object of instruction. For the Muhammadan law means the Muhammadan religion—that religion too, at a time when its followers looked upon the whole earth as their lawful prey and *before they had learned the duties of modern Musalman states in alliance with or in subjection to a Christian government*.....The study of Muhammadan law no longer answers any requirement of the Government nor does it offer to its students any career in life.....We should instead develop a rising generation of Muhammadans *no longer learned in their own narrow learning nor imbued.... with the bitter doctrines of their medieval law* but tinctured with the sober and genial knowledge of the West.... An English training would secure them an entry into the lucrative walks of life....I do not permit myself here to touch upon the means by which *through a state of indifference (to their faiths)*, the Hindus and Musalmans alike may yet reach a higher level of belief. But I firmly believe that that

> day will come and that our system of education which has hitherto produced only negative virtues is the first stage towards it......

Dr. Hunter's prophecy has literally come true and today we are reaping its results. This legacy has continued down to the present day virtually unchanged despite the two decades of our alleged independence. So efficiently implemented was the British educational policy that until now there does not exist a single school in this country where an adequate knowledge of Islam is imparted in relation to modern needs to combat secularism, materialism and atheism. Is it then any mystery why our youth are growing to maturity without the slightest appreciation for their own cultural heritage?

At the close of the last century, Lord Cromer (formerly Sir Evelyn Baring) was the master-mind of British imperialism in the Arab world. For twenty-five years from 1883 to 1907 he ruled unchallenged over Egypt. His voluminous book, *Modern Egypt*, (Macmillan, New York, 1908) is indispensable for any student who wants to know the machinations of British imperialism in all its aspects. In its concluding chapter, he leaves no doubt in the reader's mind that his policy regarded cultural imperialism much more important than direct political intervention:

> Let no practical politician think that they have a plan capable of resuscitating (Islam) which is not indeed dead and which may yet linger on for centuries, but which is nevertheless politically and socially moribund and whose gradual decay cannot be arrested by any modern palliatives, however skilfully they may be applied. (p. 184) ....

So far as can be judged at present, only two alternative courses are possible. Egypt must eventually either become autonomous or it must be incorporated into the British empire. Personally I am decidedly in favour of moving in the direction of the former of these alternatives.....All we have to do is to leave behind us a fairly good, strong and, above all things, stable government which will obviate anarchy and bankruptcy and thus prevent the Egyptian question from again becoming a serious cause of trouble to Europe. We need not inquire too minutely into the acts of such a Government.........But it is essential that, subsequently to our evacuation, that government should....act on principles which will be in conformity with the commonplace requirements of Western civilization....It is absurd to suppose that Europe will look on as a passive spectator whilst a retrograde government based on purely Muhammadan principles and obsolete oriental ideas, is established in Egypt. The material interests at stake are too important and the degree of civilization to which Egypt has attained is too advanced to admit of such a line of conduct being adopted. (pp. 563-565).....Let anyone who is inclined to take a sanguine view of this subject, cast for a moment, all details aside and consider the general nature of the problem which presents itself for solution. It is nothing less than this : **that the new generation of Egyptians has to be persúaded or forced into imbibing the true spirit of Western Civilization**. I ask myself....is it destined that under the guiding hand of England, the rays of true civilization shall at last pierce into the oldest and most interesting corner of the dark African continent and brighten with their sunshine, even the mud hut of the Egyptian *fellah* (peasant)? ....In spite of the ignorance and alleged ingratitude of the Egyptians, I still dare to cherish a hope that the present and future generations....will remember with some feeling akin to gratitude that it was the sterling qualities of the Anglo-Saxon race who first delivered them from the thraldom of their

> oppressors, who taught them that they too, had the right to be treated like human beings, who opened out to them the path which leads to moral progress and elevation of thought and who conferred upon them the material blessings which follow in the train of true Western civilization. (pp. 196-7).

This was the real aim of British imperialism and here one of its chief architects has given us the correct answer to the question as to why, since our alleged independence, foreign influences have become more firmly entrenched in our midst than ever before. The fact is that despite all propaganda to the contrary, our national freedom is only nominal. During the long period our country was subjected to foreign domination, our masters took great care that everything would be done to cut our people off from their past. In this way they successfully created, especially among the socially and economically elite, a whole class of puppets and quislings. When so-called political freedom was at last granted, our leadership automatically fell into the hands of this same westernized clique. It is crucial in the interests of these foreign imperialisms that this type of leadership continue. Since the majority of our people detest them and all they stand for, and it is therefore impossible to implement Westernization by democratic means, the most high-handed dictatorial methods must be imposed and all those who dare resist, mercilessly persecuted. Even those Great Powers, like England, France and America which never stop boasting about all the democracy and political freedom their citizens enjoy, would deny these blessings to the Muslim world, for they know full well that Islam still remains their most formidable

rival in international affairs and once they allowed democracy to take its natural course, every Muslim country would become an Islamic state! If this happened, their stranglehold over Asia and Africa would be broken once and for all. That is their great fear which explains the motivations behind all their organized conspiracies so crush Islamic movements throughout the world.

Closely allied with this political slavery, we cannot ignore the economic slavery which these circumstances have forced upon us. Under the slogan of "economic development", the imperialisms of the Great Powers are most anxious to induce us to accept their "foreign aid," which, with its high rates of interests, impoverishes the borrowing country until it is reduced to the status of a beggar. It is no exaggeration to assert that *Western big business enterprise is their chief medium of cultural invasion.* "Economic development" of "under-developed" (and now "developing") Muslim countries consequently brings in its wake the construction of hideous palatial buildings of ultra-modern architecture that give our cities an uglier face every day; luxury hotels with night clubs and cabarets; the most depraved Hollywood films on crime and illicit sex combined with our home-made imitations for our cinema; a flood of pornographic literature and pictures and indecent fashions of dress growing so popular as to be regarded as the height of social refinement. Food-adulteration—a deadly sin in the eyes of our Shariah—flourishes openly and those in the racket get rich quick at the cost of the health of all our people;

consumption of alcoholic beverages and narcotics soars while meantime our radio keeps the masses drugged all their waking hours with filthy, vulgar songs. Foreign-dominated business and industry insist that women leave the home and compete with men for jobs in offices and factories; thus our women are transformed from chaste wives, mothers, sisters and daughters into ticket collectors on buses and trains, bank-clerks, telephone-operators, sales-ladies, air-hostesses, waitresses in restaurants, room attendants in hotels, fashion-models and singers and dancers over radio, television, the films and state-organized "cultural" shows. Consequently *Purdah*, the home and the family are destroyed with illicit sex and children mature into vicious "teddies" and juvenile delinquents. All of this is no coincidence but a very deliberate policy on the part of those who want to control and dominate over us. Our enemies are trying to degrade us morally and spiritually and enfeeble us in body and mind. It is in their interests that we become as degenerate as they are and our country thoroughly corrupt from top to bottom.

In order that we may effectively combat this menace, we must understand why cultural slavery is not only inseparable from political slavery but that we cannot ever achieve genuine political freedom without cultural independence. It is impossible for Islam to flourish under hostile, alien rule. The first step we must take to achieve our cultural freedom is to lend our full support to all movements working for the revival of Islam and strive our utmost to persuade our

leadership to adopt an unadulterated Shariah as the law of our land. The Islamic movement must then assume control over all the mass-media and drastically reshape our entire educational system. Arabic must be adopted as our national language and as the chief medium of instruction in our schools and colleges. At the same time we must strenuously resist any proposal to accept the Roman alphabet for Urdu, Bengali or for the other languages spoken in our country, and continue the use of English only so long as its practical necessity remains. We must absolutely refuse the right of any foreign power to maintain military bases on our soil and in the field of economic development, we must try to rely upon our own resources and those of other friendly Muslim countries, avoiding "foreign aid" like the plague! In our international commercial dealings, particularly with the "Great Powers," we must insist upon conducting honest business as free and equal partners. Foreign Christian missions, Zionism, Communism and the Freemasons must be outlawed and anybody found guilty of overt support to these subversive activities should be punished with immediate loss of citizenship and permanent exile. As the leadership in Europe and America has always been cognisant of Islam as a potent rival in world affairs, generations of their orientalists have studied Islam in relation to their needs and aims. Since materialist philosophies originating from Western Europe now pose the greatest threat to the survival of the Islamic way of life in every Muslim country, is it not equally essential for some of our ulema to become *Occidentalists* and study European lite-

rature, history, religions and philosophies in order to produce superior works of scholarship from the Islamic viewpoint? Thus we must combat imperialism in all its varied faces so that the power of our faith and the culture it creates can grow and prosper as our salvation in this life and in the world to come.

ISLAM IS A CIVILIZATION

It is now becoming fashionable among the modernizers, most of them students of orientalists, to assert that Islam is a religion only in the narrowest sense of the term which can be compatible with any culture. They think we should reject our historical traditions and begin from nothingness all over again on our own.

According to many people, both Muslim and non-Muslim, Islam suggests a specific way of life which can hardly admit of any variety and change and if any change is introduced into this definite way of life, it is looked upon by the proponents of this view as a change in Islam itself or in the Islamic system of values. It is interesting to see that this view is held not only by many adherents of Islam who identify Islam with a specific traditional way of life but, as we have said just now, is supported by several eminent non-Muslim students of Islam. On the other hand, the view has been put forward equally by such non-Muslim students of Islam as Professor Gustave von Grunebaum that Islam is not at all the name of any culture but denotes certain principles, formulas, and rules laid down by the Quran and Sunnah of the Holy Prophet that are capable of living with and even making compromises with the local conditions of time and climes. Cultural historians like Grunebaum conclude that Islam is not the name of any culture in itself but rather a more or less vague set of formulas which may be mechanically juxtaposed with, superimposed on or transformed into any cultural pattern.*

* "What is Islamic Culture?", Dr. Fazlur Rahman, *The Light*, Lahore, March 24, 1973, p. 5.

The author of the above lines is trying to prove that the westernization of the Muslim world has done it no harm and that a Muslim can adopt Western culture and still remain a perfectly good Muslim.

There is no hope for the revival, propagation and survival of Islam unless it is presented to westernized Muslims and non-Muslims, not as a mere vague set of doctrines and mode of worship that can be made compatible with any culture but as a specific civilization based on absolute, transcendental values which was, until the very recent past, an autonomous, independent historical reality. In presenting Islam to non-Muslims, it is not enough to propagate its theoretical teachings but one must give concrete instances how they have been actually implemented in history, preferably taking examples from recent times. Otherwise no non-Muslim will be convinced that Islam is practicable in contemporary conditions. The failure to present Islam as a reality in history through the lives of its great men, past and present, will give the non-Muslim seeker after Truth the impression that Islam is abstract theory or idle philosophy, which died in the remote past, to be found in books only and that in today's world, it is unrealistic and unworkable.

Islamic history is replete with fratricidal wars, with the struggle for power among the unscrupulous, the exploitation of one racial group by another and in subordination to narrow ends. The political dimension of Islam confronts us with a highly confused spectacle. The attempt to hold together a state which was supposedly built on Muslim ideology has miserably failed. The fondly cherished belief that this ideology was strong enough to override geographical and

ethnic conflicts has proved to be a tragic illusion. Nor has the idea of bringing the Muslim states together in a bloc, to make them think alike and act in unison on all issues of international importance, any prospect of success.*

Such are the views of the modernists, inspired by orientalist influence, that Islamic history has failed. They try to convince people that Islam has failed in history by belittling and downgrading all of our great historical personalities. Even the venerable Companions of the Prophet are not spared.

If Islam has not been practically implemented in the past, then it has no prospects for the future. Non-Muslims can judge Islam only so far as they have known and seen it practiced by Muslims. If Islamic history has been a failure, the non-Muslims will rightly conclude that Islam has no power and no authority to reform the lives of its adherents. If Muslims of the present and Muslims of the past cannot prove their moral superiority over non-Muslims, the non-Muslims will inevitably conclude that Islam itself is a failure so that the sooner Muslims accept the supremacy of Western civilization, the better.

Within recent decades, a number of books have been written by the modernists asserting that the Islamic state came to an end after the Khalifate Rashidun. If one accepts this view, it logically follows that since the greatest Companions of the Holy Prophet were unable to uphold the Islamic state for more than thirty years and Muslim history after that had no

* "The Muslim Attitude : A Plea for Re-orientation," Dr. Syed Vahid-ud-din, *Impact International Fortnightly*, London, February 22, 1973, pp. 8-9.

value. from the Islamic standpoint, what hope is there for modern Muslims, who are so far below their excellence, to establish an Islamic state today ? The orientalists say that Islamic culture exhausted its creativity after the thirteenth century A.D. and contributed nothing to mankind after that* because they hold Islamic civilization important only so far as it contributed its learning to Europe in medieval times and deny it any validity as an independent entity in its own right. For instance, Dr. Philip K. Hitti in his *History of the Arabs* says that Islamic civihzation was nothing but a heterogeneous conglomeration of Persian, Nestorian, Byzantine and Indian influences and that Islam itself is only a confused mixture of Judaism, Christianity and Arab paganism!

In order to propagate Islam effectively to non-Muslims, all these views must be vigorously refuted by calm, logical, persuasive scholarship. We must present Islamic history to Muslims and non-Muslims in positive terms as a success until the advent of Western domination. Of course, our black pages cannot be overlooked but the good far outweighs the bad. The presentation of Islamic history must be written in an inspiring manner to make us proud of our civilization and its cultural heritage.**

The underlying purpose in distorting Islamic history was to sow discord among the Muslims or ridicule, belittle and condemn Muslim rulers and in this way gradually make the

---

* A convincing, scholarly refutation of this view can be found in *Islamic Studies*, Seyyed Hossein Nasr, Libraire du Liban, Beirut, 1967, pp. 100-105.

** For a correct interpretation of Muslim history, see *Saviours of the Islamic Spirit*, Abul Hasan Ali Nadwi, Academy at Islamic Research and Publications, Lucknow, 1971.

Muslim youth averse to his glorious past and its heroes. For the enemies of Islam feared that the lives of their heroes and their past might inspire the Muslim youth to new deeds of heroism. It was Islam that enabled them to make history such as to this day remains unsurpassed in grandeur, sublimity and glory. It is indeed such a history which if properly taught in our schools and colleges is still capable of producing young men, sound in body, firm in convictions and polite in manners, brave, steadfast—the successful leaders of men! It can still give us young men who should unite in their person the truth of Abu Bakr, the justice of Omar, the nobility of Othman, the bravery of Ali, the generalship of Khalid, the experience of Amr, the statesmanship and sagacity of Mu'awiya and the fearlessness of Ibn al-Zubair...... The enemies of Islam also insist on circulating such fabricated accounts and stories about certain Umayyad Khalifs and their great generals and present them in false colours to create hatred and contempt for them. Incidentally, those very Umayyad Khalifs and their great generals have been most unpopular among the Christian missionaries for it was in their days when the power of Islam was finally established. Their troops had penetrated deep into the very heart of Europe and their five hundred thousand men army stood only three hundred kilometers from the city of Paris. Hundreds of troops were at the same time pouring out of Damascus, sweeping away all traces of paganism. That is why the Christian missionaries are so annoyed with these Khalifs and generals. It is, in fact, this very Christian hatred which is reflected in the speeches, lectures, articles and books of their spiritual disciples—the modernists—who too try to villify these Khalifs and great generals under whom the Islamic forces fought some of the most crucial battles against their Western enemies—the crusaders and their eastern counterparts, the pagans and magians. Thanks to the disruptive elements in Muslim society, the imperialists were successful in their mission of making the Muslim youth steadily drift away from

> Islam and look upon Europe as their beau-ideal and its civilization and heroes the only subjects worth studying. The matter has come to such a pass that our youth have lost the capacity to appreciate any good thing which did not originate in the West.*

We must not scorn Islamic history because the Islamic ideal was not always implemented in its ideal perfection. We must not conclude that just because the monarchs who followed the Khalifate Rashidun were inferior to them, that none of them had any merits at all. There are dark periods in Islamic history, not because Islam has failed, but because Muslims are human beings and not angels and thus subjected to the same weaknesses, shortcomings, trials and temptations as other people.

Why was Islamic civilization destroyed ? Was it because of internal decay? We must take a broad world-wide anthropological view. At the advent of Western supremacy, there were many non-European civilizations and cultures in the world—primitive and highly-developed—the Indian, the Chinese, the Japanese, the cultures of Africa and the American Indian. All of them without a single exception were doomed to extinction because of the Western impact. It cannot be correct to assume that they all fell prey to the West because of internal decay. Had it not been for European imperialism, all of these non-European cultures could have continued to develop along their own independent lines for ages. The same holds true for Islamic civilization. It would give the student of

*Preface to *The Great Battle of Badr*, Muhammad Ahmad Bushumail, Islamic Publications, Lahore, 1970, pp. xxvi-xxviii.

history a more correct view to compare modern Western civilization, with its superior physical energy, organization and technology, to a deadly poison—a cancerous, malignant growth which indiscriminately destroyed everything in its path—the healthy tissue along with the diseased, the good along with the bad.

The presentation of Islamic history should not confine its heroes to the distant past. Sufficient attention should be paid to the valiant resistance of the *Ummah* throughout the Muslim world against European imperialism in all its forms—the Sanussi and the Mahdists in Africa, Sultan Abdul Hamid II of Turkey, Sultan Tippu of India, the courageous struggle of the Moros of the Philippines against the Christianization drive of imperialist Spain and the Palestinian Arabs against Zionism. Islamic history is unique in that whenever corruptions and deviations did occur, courageous *Mujaddids* and ulama always resisted and spoke the truth boldly even at the risk of their lives. Since the death of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him), Allah has sent to the Muslims of every age, including the modern age, *Mujaddids* to combat both external threats and internal corruption. A pessimistic view of the prospects of Islam for the future is only self-defeating—it will demoralize the youth so they naturally feel that any effort on their part is futile and nothing can be done. The bleak picture of the present condition of the Muslims can be counteracted by a detailed treatment of all the movements striving for Islamic renaissance (i.e.

the Nursi movement in Turkey, al-Ikhwan al-Muslimun in the Arab world and the Jama'at-e-Islami in Pakistan). Instead of belittling these movements as inadequate in scope, the youth should be encouraged to do much more work in the same field.

Can a civilization, once destroyed, be revived? The answer of Western historians is unanimously in the negtative. They tell us that since "Progress" and "Change" is the law of "Evolution," the future can never repeat the past and thus a defunct civilization can no more be revived than a dead man can be restored to life. This logic is fallacious because human civilization is not a biological but an ideological phenomenon. The anthropologists tell us that every civilization without exception is based upon a set of moral, spiritual and aesthetic values cherished by its members. Therefore, at least theoretically, any civilization can be resurrected once the values and way of life inspired by those values command the allegiance of large numbers of people, organized and galvanised by effective leadership. The religious view, however, is the most authoritative. Since Islam is a universal faith intended by Almighty Allah for all mankind based upon absolute transcendental values in the Divine Revelations to the Prophets, it cannot be restricted to any limited time or place. The Quran tells us that Islam is intended by Almighty Allah to transcend all historical periods and geographical boundaries.

If Islam is universal, then why should Muslims identify it with a specific culture and traditional way

of life ? The modernists among us will assert :

> There is similar freedom in regard to architecture too. A Muslim can a pray under the canopy of the sky or under a roof built in any style. As a matter of fact, the second Khalif, Umar, when he went to take over the city of Jerusalem, would not mind praying inside a church. This freedom proved a valuable aid to originality. The early Muslims borrowed frankly and with an air of confidence from the Roman style which reached its culmination in Spain in the West and India in the East.*

The author of the above quote is trying to tell us that there is no such thing as Muslim architecture!** Thus if a mosque can be built in any architectural style and still remain a perfectly good mosque, there is no reason why Muslims should not make their cities identical copies of London and New York*** and they can still be as "Muslim" as before ! These modernists do not seem to realize that Hazrat Umar's willingness to pray inside a church was only a temporary, make-shift measure. As soon as the Muslims in Jerusalem and elsewhere had acquired the resources, they built

---

*"Some Aspects of Islamic Culture," Dr. S. M. Yusuf, *The Light*, Lahore, June 16, 1973, p. 5.

**An excellent exposition of the profound, sacred meanings of Islamic art, architecture and traditional city planning in Persia is: *The Sense of Unity*, Nader Ardaran and Laleh Bakhtiar with introduction by Seyyed Hossein Nasr, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1973.

*** "A problem hardly ever discussed now-a-days is the Islamic city. Everywhere from Morocco to Indonesia, the Muslim city is a disaster area not only as far as Islam's relevance to urban life is concerned but especially as regards Western urban planning theories which dominate the minds of all our city-planners and city authorities today. Under the title of ISLAM AND MODERNISM IN AN ARAB CITY ; A STUDY IN CONFLICTING URBAN VALUES, Dr. Munir Ahmad of the State University of Chicago described the plight of modern Baghdad. Noting the harmful effects of Western-type urbanization, he deplored the raising of structures embodying alien values without any awareness of their corrosive influence on Islamic social life" : see "Islam and Modernism: Discussions by American Muslim Social Scientists," *The Muslim World*, A Weekly Review of the Motamar, Karachi, August 24, 1974, pp. 2-3.

their own mosques in an artistic style which Muslims and non-Muslims acknowledged as distinctly Muslim architecture. This does not mean that foreign styles did not influence the early Muslims at all; but being politically and culturally dominant, they could utilize all useful knowledge from other peoples and transform it into something uniquely and characteristically their own. They could borrow without being overwhelmed. In other words, when Islamic civilization was supreme, the Muslims *created* ; today under Western cultural domination, they can only imitate.

The rejection of our historical heritage means our death : its affirmation will restore us to life, health and vigour. Islam is not merely a religion but a complete civilization which was successfully implemented in history. Therefore an acceptance of our history implies an acceptance of our historical civilization. In fact, all major religions in history—Christianity, Buddhism and Hindusim—were also complete civilizations. Any religion worthy of the name demands that its ideals be implemented as an historical reality in the cultural life of the people. Why then should we deny the historical basis of the Islamic way of life? Modernists will then pose the question why the universal should be identified with the particular ? This is a necessity. Otherwise, instead of a full, rich cultural heritage throughout the ages, Islam is reduced to an emasculated, colourless, feeble, uninspiring, vague set of "principles" lacking any concrete reality.

The modernists insist that there is no such thing as Islamic dress, architecture, aesthetic tastes and that it

makes no difference if a Muslim assumes an Arabic or an English name. They say that it matters not if Muslims speak English or Arabic, use the Arabic script or adopt Roman letters for their regional languages or abandon the Muslim lunar calendar for Western systems of reckoning time. Such things are purely "outward" and have no significance in the Islamic scheme of life. Only the "Spirit" counts. The letter is of no account. This kind of thinking reminds me of a young American university student of Middle Eastern affairs I met who, when I expressed regret that Arab women were abandoning their traditional dress for the modern, asked me what had to do with Islam? Couldn't the women believe in Allah and Holy Prophet just the same wearing a mini-skirt ? I replied that it makes a great difference indeed, the difference between a materialistic and religious outlook.

The letter lives in the spirit and the spirit demands its concrete cultural expression in human society if it is to survive and grow. Therefore Islam is not merely theological doctrine and a mode of worship but a full-fledged civilization with its own distinctive dress, architecture, aesthetic taste, language, alphabet, calendar, sciences and arts. This does not mean that Islamic civilization was stagnant and immune to all changes and external influences. A revived Islamic civilization would grow and constantly develop within its own ethos, accepting useful knowledge from other peoples without ever losing its identity. It would grow and develop much as a tree

grows ; the more it grows, the more it remains the same. Change for the sake of change, the concept of evolutionary progress and permanent revolution is alien to Islamic concepts. Islam is based on absolute, transcendental theological, moral and spiritual values enshrined in the Quran, the Sunnah and the Shariah, based on these sources, which can only be interpreted within strict limits. These sources are immutable which gives stability, permanence and authority to the moral and social order, imparting an inward peace and contentment to the people unknown to the contemporary age. The diversity of the various Muslim peoples within the orbit of Islamic civilization was in minor details only. In the essentials, they were united by an inward harmony and cultural values common to them all. Muslim civilization embodied unity in diversity.

Next to a man's body, his clothes are the nearest things to his soul and have tremendous potentialities for corruption or purification. Every civilization without exception has its definite, unique physical appearance ; the inward is expressed in the outward; the spirit in the tangible physical reality. Therefore if a Muslim alters his name or his physical appearance by adopting foreign dress, he changes his cultural allegiance. Of course, one can cite rare exceptional cases of good Muslims who had English names and wear Western dress* but they remain Muslim not because of this but despite it.

---

*Outstanding examples are the late English convert, Marmaduke Pickthall and the American Professor, Dr. Thomas Ballantine Irving who is an internationally recognized authority on Muslim Spain.

Those who work for *Tabligh*, either in the East or West, should propagate Islam, not in a narrow, restricted, emaciated, cold conception of remote abstract theories, but with a warm acceptance of the full and rich cultural inheritance of the Muslims throughout history the world over.

CAN ISLAM BE RECONCILED WITH THE SPIRIT OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY?

"ISLAM shall perish unless it comes to terms with the modern world." Such is the cliche constantly on the lips of our modern-educated elite in every Muslim country. They never tire of reminding us that we cannot live in a by-gone age. We are taught that it is unrealistic to "turn the clock back" because nothing can reverse the trend of history. Therefore we have no choice except to conform our faith to the demands of an ever-changing secular society. In order to be strong, we are told we must reject "traditional" interpretations of the Quran and read it "rationally" in the light of modern life. All reforms advocated by the governments of Muslim countries have this as their goal. We shall now seek to examine the most important of these and their effect upon the Islamic community.

Because the idea of an Islamic state is an anathema in a world dominated by opportunism, these modern-educated leaders tell us that we must accept the abolition of the Khalifate as permanent and dismiss any possibility of its revival in the future. Politics and government based on religion are branded as "medieval." Therefore in order to take their place in the modern world, Muslims must reconcile themselves to secular rule. To expound this argument books[1]

1. *Islam and the Principles of Government* (*al-Islam wa Usul al-Hukm*) Ali Abd al-Raziq, Cairo, 1925.

From Here We Start (*Min Huna Nabda*) Khalid Muhammad Khalid, Cairo, 1950.

have been written in certain Muslim countries blaming the Khalifate for all the evils afflicting us throughout history. It is claimed that the Khalifate is not really part of Islam because the Holy Prophet's mission was limited to preaching. He never wished to rule. Only expediency forced him to do so. Intellectual dishonesty could scarcely sink to more abysmal depths. Islam cannot live without an Islamic community. And the Islamic community cannot survive without organized leadership.

Because the Shariah is considered by our modern-educated elite as outmoded and its conception of justice inferior to Western legal systems, it is believed that only secular laws can promote the social well-being of society.[2] The punishments laid down in the Quran and Sunnah for illicit sex, drinking, gambling or lending money at interest are attacked as cruel and inhuman. But, is the merit of a law to be judged according to its leniency? Does the criminal deserve more sympathy than society? Ethical values without the sanction and force of Law behind them soon deteriorate into empty platitudes.

Because the ideal of a universal Islamic brotherhood transcending race, language, and geography is irreconcilable with the supremacy of national sovereignty, in order to "adapt to the spirit of the twentieth century", our modern-educated leaders insist that the Ummat must be replaced by parochial nationalisms.[3] This cannot but result in the isolation

2. *A Modern Interpretation of Islam*, Asaf Ali Fyzee, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963.

3. *Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization*, Ziya Gokalp, Columbia University Press, New York, 1959.

and alienation of the different Muslim peoples from each other. Instead of stressing a common Islamic heritage, our leaders glorify a mythical past as if it were a Golden Age, Islam snatched away from us. That is why we find Turkish nationalists scorning the Ottoman period as mere subjection to foreign culture and foreign languages and why simultaneously Reza Shah Pahlevi changed the name of "Persia" to "Iran"—the alleged homeland of the "Aryan" race. Nationalism is behind the constant clamour for official translations of the Holy Quran without the Arabic text. The adoption of the Latin alphabet by Turkey, Malaysia and Indonesia together with the supremacy of English and the neglect of Arabic in the educational systems of the non-Arab Muslim countries reinforced by Arab nationalist demands, that the colloquial dialects replace the classical tongue in literary endeavors, have consequently made the language of Quran increasingly unintelligible for the rising generations. Not only would official translations of Holy Quran with Arabic text complete the destruction of the Ummat but also (God forbid!) inevitably corrupt the Text itself.

In every Muslim country those in positions of authority and influence insist upon the necessity of adopting all the applications of modern science and technology if we are to successfully compete with the rest of the world. They labor under the delusion that we can accept all the positive "benefits" of modern civilization while at the same time rejecting those aspects contrary to Islamic teachings. In other words, they mean that if our societies are to regain their

strength and vigor, we must adopt without reservation, as the goal of our public life, foreign technical "assistance" programmes, economic development and industrialization to eliminate poverty, disease and illiteracy and promote a "higher standard of living" for the people. To those who maintain that we can accept the good and reject the evil in modern civilization, it must never be forgotten that each civilization is an integrated entity. No single aspect of a culture can stand isolated; rather they are all dependent upon each other. That is why it is impossible for the concrete achievements of a civilization to remain unaffected by its basic character. The disciples of modernism are so severely afflicted with economic mania that economics has become the sole standard of judgment. As a result of the rejection of the Hereafter, Europeans and Americans concentrate their whole attention upon the attainment of bodily health, physical comfort and worldly prosperity, consequently outstripping all other peoples in these respects. Other civilizations, including Islamic civilization, never attained these heights of proficiency, not because science or technology was ever rejected on principle but because the best minds were diverted to other pursuits regarded as more valuable.

The "emancipation" of Muslim women is continuously cited as essential for social progress.[4] "Emancipation" is interpreted by the feminists as the adoption of immodest "fashion", employment of women outside the home and their full participation in public life with the inevitable disintegration of home and family.

---

4. *The New Woman*, Qassim Amin Bey, Cairo, 1901.

The adoption of Western clothing is officially encouraged by every government in the Muslim world. Turkey has reached the extreme limits by decreeing Western dress compulsory by law. Western clothing has become symbolic of "advancement" and "progress" while the indigenous clothing, increasingly confined to the very poor in the rural districts, is cited as synonymous with "backwardness." To strive for the elimination of all visible signs of Muslim identity by imitating the dress, architecture and living habits of a civilization so hostile to Islam, is tantamount to apostasy.[5] Our Holy Prophet was most emphatic on this subject when he condemned one who imitates the unbelievers as one of them.

Thus we have demonstrated why it is not possible to reconcile Islam with the "spirit of the twentieth century." The more we Muslims try to "reform" Islam to make it "compatible" with modern life, the weaker we shall become. We Muslims shall grow in strength and vigor not by "moving along with the trend of the time" but only by fighting against it!

---

5. *Islam at the Crossroads*, Muhammad Asad, Lahore, 1934.
Nationalism and India, Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi, Pathankot, 1939

THE FALLACY OF MODERNISM

In the context of the Muslim community, a modernist means one who is dissatisfied with Islam as universally understood and accepted from the days of our Holy Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) onwards and who endeavours to "reinterpret" the faith in such a way that "proves" there is no conflict between Islam and modern Western civilization. Although Muslim in name, the modernist passes judgment upon Islam solely on the basis of those ideals imported from Europe which he consciously or unconsciously assumes are superior. Anything of the former found incompatible with the latter must be discarded.

> We know that the international world and especially the Western Christian world are looking on with great misgivings about what is going to happen in our countries. (Now that we have obtained our political independence), there is the great fear of the rise of theocracy in the Islamic countries with the accompanying possibility of pan-Islamism, reviving the Jihad, the holy war, against all unbelievers.... If, on the one hand, we assure the West that we are not going to grow into a peril for the Western world, on the other hand, it is of the utmost importance for us to get clear ourselves about we are doing and intend to do in our countries to adopt the present pattern of (Western civilization) and to promote our further progress alongside the progress of the (rest of) the world......
>
> Quoted from *Philosophy and Ideology, Hadji Agus* Salim, former Foreign Minister of Indonesia, *The Light*, organ of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Lahore, September 8, 1967, p. 2.

Mustafa al-Maraghi, a disciple of Sheikh Muhammad Abduh, and rector of al-Azhar University in Cairo from 1927-1929 and from 1935-1945 expressed the typical view-point of the modernists when in a message for some American Muslims, he said: "These people have extracted their knowledge of Islam from books. I hope that they will never visit an Islamic country and behold the misery, ignorance, fanaticism and backwardness which we present."[1]

This same view-point is reflected in a Canadian convert's letter to me in criticism of this book where he wrote:

> Allah has made me a Caucasian, a Canadian, a twentieth-century man and he has made me a Muslim. If I had to be a black, unwashed, illiterate Beduin who lives as his ancestors did, then I would rather be dead. If Islam is incapable of surviving intact in a non-Muslim country; if a Muslim can't be a Westerner, can't be modern or accept the modernism of the West and can't prosper in a Christian atmosphere, then this religion is fit only for the dregs of the desert from whence it came.
>
> (Personal letter to me by Gregory Taylor, Winnipeg, Canada, January 15, 1967).

Modernists will not only most emphatically insist they are Muslims but the best and truest of Muslims and dub those who oppose them as "reactionaries," "fanatics," or "obscurantists." The more idealistic and high-minded among them are carried away by the delusion that they alone can "save" Islam from utter ruin by interpreting it in the light of secularism and materialism.

---

1. Quoted from "The Re-evaluation of Islam in Turkey," Fareed S. Jafri *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, June 30, 1967.

In order to resolve the painful conflict between two opposing philosophies of life and convince himself that incompatibles are compatible, the modernist is compelled to resort to self-deception and fallacious reasoning to an incredible degree. To give the reader some idea of the modernist mind at work, here are some of their most widely publicized apologetic distortions of Islamic history:

1. According to the modernists, during the lifetime of our Holy Prophet and the pious Khalifate, Islam was the most "liberal", "progressive" and "rational" religion; but at the hands of our Imams, jurists, traditionalists and theologians, it became more and more "fossilized", "dogmatic", "bigoted," "static" and "reactionary" which was responsible for our present weakness and humiliation. From this premise the modernists draw the conclusion that the *ulema* or religious scholars are responsible for all the evils in the Muslim world. As one of them writes:

> In every Muslim country from Saudi Arabia to Mauritania and from Indonesia to Pakistan, the Muslim people are today struggling for a bare existence. The Mullas will blame Western influence for this decadence. They forget that in those places where Western influence has not yet penetrated, one sees the very worst picture of Islam. Would they deny me the fact that the worst and the most backward places are not those where the Western winds of progress have swept through, but those where for centuries the abuses of religious authority have been perpetuated by the Mullas? It is because of this class which will not permit Islam to adjust freely to the changing times, that Islam is in a state of stagnation.... *To get rid of all the curses afflicting the Muslim world, we will have to forget*

> *all interpretations of the Quran given to us by dogmatic learned men......*The day we try to understand the Quran by ourselves, we will be able to save Islam; to save our women from the indignity of over 1,400 years; we will be able to bring them under the light of freedom and equality. Religion will be practised by love and not by compulsion. Life will be free from boredom. There will be play as well as prayer and we will see the beautiful meaning of Islam as a clear-cut diamond.
>
> "The Need for a Re-evaluation of Islam in Pakistan," Fareed S. Jafri, *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, August 11, 1967.

In other words, since the lifetime of our Holy Prophet, until the present age, Muslims have been interpreting Islam in an entirely false manner and only today under the impact of Western civilization have the modernists gained true understanding and perspective! Such "dogmatic learned men" as Bukhari, Muslim, Abu Hanifa, Shafei, Malik, Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, al-Ghazzali and Ibn Taimiya were all wrong and unless the Muslims stop respecting them and exchange their authority for that of men like Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, we can never achieve our salvation!

2. The "eternal, sacred principles" of Islam must be separated from those laws and injunctions contrary to the spirit of modern life. The latter must be rejected as meant only for the primitive society of the Holy Prophet's day and neither relevant nor appropriate for such an "advanced" civilization as ours. Even such unquestioned essentials of Islam as prayer (namaz), fasting the month of Ramadan, Zakat and Haj (pilgrimage) should be interpreted in such a lax, permissive manner that their strict observance is no longer obligatory.

3. Muslims made such great cultural contributions to medieval Europe that without them, modern civilization, as we know it today, could have never arisen. In other words, Islam was the parent of Western civilization which is only a further development of its principles and values. Although not Muslims in name, the adherents of Western civilization have remained far truer to the "spirit" of Islam than the Muslims themselves! This being the case, Muslims can regain their genuine legacy only by adopting modern culture.

As for their flowery eulogies of our Holy Prophet and his Companions for their "liberalism" and "progressive-mindedness," such indulgence in the realm of fiction leaves no doubt that they do not want any part of Islam as it is but only as they would like it to be. What could be more arrogant than their complacent assumption that our Imams living in the utmost piety were inferior in their interpretation of Islam to a modernist of today contaminated with atheism and materialism? All their professed reverence of Islam's "eternal, sacred principles" serves only to camouflage disbelief and outright heresy. If they could have their way, they would spare nothing. If, as the modernists believe, Islam has no intrinsic validity as a distinctive and independent way of life and cannot be justified on its own merits except to the extent to which it can be forced into conformity to an alien set of values inherently contradictory to it, then what is the purpose of preserving anything of the Islamic heritage or indeed, of remaining Muslim at all?

ISLAM AND CONTEMPORARY HERESIES

The word "heresy" is so unpopular today that whoever dares invoke it against any person or idea is at once branded by our "enlightened liberals" as a bigot and a fanatic. Yet as much as the invocation of heresy has been abused, this does not at all refute its necessity in cases where it is entirely warranted and justified. There is at present an all-out campaign on the part of Christian missions and secular-minded Western Orientalists alike wholeheartedly to support our indigenous modernists in their attempts to concoct a new brand of Islam for us. Says Dr. Kenneth Cragg, in his *Call of the Minaret* (Oxford University Press, 1956):

> There can be little doubt that the conservative is theoretically right in resisting what is un-Islamic in its origin. On the understanding of a thousand and more years that it is derived from revelation, Muslim law cannot suddenly and blandly affirm that its true basis is pragmatic, prudential and worldly-wise. Nevertheless time compels modification, adaptation and enlargement. **The modern mind is right in its instinctive awareness that Islam must either baptize change into its spirit or renounce its own relevance to life. Since it cannot do the latter, it must somehow do the former.** (p. 17).... Therefore we (Christian missionaries) must be ready sympathetically to hear Islam equated with true democracy, perfect socialism, innocuous capitalism and abiding peace. It would, of course, be entirely unjust to stand by Lord Cromer's famous and foolish dictum that Islam reformed is Islam no longer. We have neither the right nor desire to

> insist that Islam shall remain perpetually what at one time we thought it was. (p. 208)

This means that our indigenous modernists who want to force Islam into the rigid mold of modern secularism and materialism are in alliance with the Christian missions and foreign imperialisms. Indeed, they are the most effective agents for accomplishing their work.

It is the duty of all Islam-loving scholars to unanimously assert the absolute eternity, universality, finality, self-sufficiency and total independence of Islam from man-made philosophies. All attempts to undermine the validity of any of these characteristics, as laid down in Holy Quran and Sunnah, should be straightforwardly condemned as heretical. To avoid dissension within the ranks of the Ummat, what should be condemned as heretical are not so much individuals or groups of individuals as ideas. So long as a Muslim claims himself part of the Ummat or Muslim community and does not publicly reject the unity of God and the finality of Muhammad's (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) Prophethood, we cannot put him out. The final judgment of an individual belongs to God and to nobody else. However, the unanimous condemnation of the modernist movement as heretical and inimical to the teachings of Islam will quickly and effectively dispel all confusion and doubts in the minds of our rising generation as to what Islam is and what it is not. The absence of such a declaration will strengthen modernist contentions that Islam has no fixed teachings of its own but can be virtually ANYTHING the Muslim-named in power wish!

The most sinister project of the modernist movement is what they call "the reinterpretation of Islam in the light of modern thought." Their siren song is that "Islam must change with the changing times." So obsessed are these people with "progress" that mere change is regarded as a virtue in itself. They never stop to ask themselves where this change is taking us, much less if it is for good or evil. Islam must change with the changing times, no matter what the cost! In their eyes the supreme virtue is merely to go the way of the world and drift whichever way the wind is blowing. If music, dancing, picture, and statue are beloved in the West, then they must be truly "Islamic" and we Muslims are obliged to indulge in them, too. If interest on capital is the basis of modern economy, then it must be so in the Muslim countries if we are to rid ourselves of "backwardness", and "stagnation" and be "advanced" and "up-to-date." If immodest fashions are the accepted mode in modern life, then we Muslims must interpret this as "Islamic" dress; if Purdah is condemned by the Christian missionaries as proof of the so-called "degradation" and "inferior" status of Muslim women, then we Muslims have to accept them at their word and strive our utmost to facilitate the "emancipation" of women as Europe and America understand it; if modernism says polygamy and divorce by "talaq" are unendurable evils, then all the countries of the Muslim world, to be "enlightened" and "progressive" have no choice but to modify their family laws accordingly. As Dr. Kenneth Cragg writes:

> It has become increasingly general to interpret the Quranic allowance of four wives on condition of equal

> treatment as a virtual prohibition of more than one. Whatever may be thought of the exegesis, the result is highly desirable...... (Ibid, p. 14).

That is, "desirable" for Dr. Kenneth Cragg and similarly interested parties. To them it matters not how much hypocrisy and intellectual dishonesty are involved in these sophistries. The end justifies the means!

SIR SAYYID AHMAD KHAN—THE PIONEER OF MODERNISM IN THE MUSLIM WORLD

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan was born in Delhi on October 17, 1817 and raised in a religious atmosphere. He was educated along the classical, traditional lines, but was so impatient with his Arabic and Persian studies that he abandoned them as soon he could. During his youth he led a carefree life, frequently attending convivial parties where singing and dancing were the principal entertainments. After the death of his father in 1838, he found employment with the East India Company. In due course, he was appointed a sub-judge in different towns.

When he was twenty-nine he decided to increase the scant religious knowledge he had acquired so half-heartedly during his youth and pursued his studies under the well-known scholars of his day. In his spare time he wrote some religious tracts, including a biography of the Prophet, which, although conforming to orthodoxy, were mediocre both in content and literary style.

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan first achieved notoriety upon the publication in 1847 of *Athar al Sanadid*, a history of the famous people and monuments of Delhi. This historical work, which displayed a scholarship so conspicuously lacking in his religious writings, was reprinted in 1854, translated into French several years later and in 1863, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan was awarded honorary membership in the Royal Asiatic Society of London. In reviewing this book, the

Urdu poet, Ghalib remarked that Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan should study English culture instead of wasting his time in dreaming about the Golden Age of Islamic civilization in India. We shall presently see how seriously he accepted this advice.

After the Mutiny in 1857 and the subsequent British domination of India, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan arrived at the conclusion that the salvation of the Muslims depended upon cooperating and befriending the British and adopting their culture. He decided to make himself self-appointed mediator. He pointed out that enmity between Christians and Muslims on religious grounds is prohibited by Islam "because of all the religions in the world, Islam has the most respect for Christ and his guidance." He assured the English that it was taught by Islam that "if through the will of God, we are subdued by a nation which grants us religious freedom, rules with justice, maintains peace in the country and respects our individuality and property as the British are now doing in India, we are obliged to be loyal to it." In an attempt to reconcile political servility to Islam, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan cited the example of Joseph who served the Egyptian Pharaoh loyally and obediently even though the latter was not a Muslim. In his zeal to serve the interests of British imperialism, he decided to start a special publication of official notes relating to loyal Muslims in the service of the British Government. "I shall mention the rewards and favours our equitable and impartial Government has bestowed on them for their loyalty in order that the generosity, the justice and the patronage may become better known and all the

Muslim subjects of India by reading it may express their gratitude to our benevolent Government."[1]

In promoting the assimilation of the Muslims to English culture, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan recognized the necessity for removing social barriers. At this time he issued his famous *Fatwa* declaring it lawful for Muslims to eat at the same table with Christians. To lure the Muslims into accepting this idea, he quoted the verse from the Quran which says that the food of the people of the Scriptures is lawful for Muslims. But he ran into serious difficulty when it came to the question of ritually unclean meat. He found it necessary to interpret dubious Hadith to the effect that it is permissible for Muslims to eat the flesh of animals not slaughtered by *Zabah*.

In April 1869 Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan decided to visit England and see with his own eyes the sources of British power so that he could help his countrymen along the same path. He was so impressed with what he saw that he was convinced of the superiority of the English over the Muslims of India not only in education, science and technology but socially, morally and spiritually as well. In one of his letters from London dated October 15, 1869 he wrote home as follows :

> Without flattering the English, I can truly say that the natives of India, high and low, merchants and petty shopkeepers, educated and illiterate, when contrasted with the English in education, manners and uprightness are as like them as a dirty animal is to an able and handsome man. The English have reason for believing us in India to be

1. quoted from *The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan*, J. M. S. Baljon. Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, p. 26.

> imbecile brutes.....What I have seen and see daily is utterly beyond the imagination of a native of India. The fatal shroud of complacent self-esteem is wrapt around the Mohammedan community. They remember the old tales of their ancestors and think that there are none like themselves. The Mohammedans of Egypt and Turkey are daily becoming more civilised. Until the modern education of the masses is pushed on as it is here, it is impossible for a native to become civilised and honoured.

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan was determined to prove that Islam could be transformed into the true religion of humanity, civilization and progress as soon as antiquated ideas and customs contrary to the spirit of modern times were abandoned.

In order to promote a modernized class of Muslims, Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan founded a school at Aligarh in 1878. Convinced of the inadequacies of Arabic, Persian, Urdu or any of the Indian vernaculars, he insisted on English as the sole medium of instruction. In 1920 Aligarh was promoted to the status of a university.

Sayyid Ahmad Khan was the leading pioneer of modernist apologetics. Some apologetic interpretations originated by him are :

1. Polygamy is contrary to the "spirit" of Islam and should not be permitted except in rare, exceptional cases.
2. Islam prohibits slavery absolutely, even the enslavement of war prisoners which is permitted by the Shariah.
3. Modern banks, business transactions, loans and

international trade comprising our modern economy, although all involving payment of interest, do not properly fall under the definition of *riba* and thus are not contrary to the law of the Quran.

4. The punishments laid down in the Quran and Sunnah for amputation of the hand for theft, stoning for adultery and a hundred lashes for fornication are barbarous and suitable only for a primitive society which lacks prisons.

5. Jihad is banned except in the direst necessity of self-defence.

The only criterion Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan considered valid in demonstrating the truth of Islam was its conformity to nineteenth century scientific naturalism. He argued that if religion is compatible with human nature or nature in general, then it must be true. However, in order to prove that Islam was the religion of science and reason, he felt compelled to deny not only the miracles, angels, *djinn* and the virgin birth of Jesus, explaining away the *Miraj* of the Prophet as simply a dream, but also the bodily resurrection, the Day of Judgment, Heaven and Hell, all of which he insisted must not be accepted literally but only symbolically. He even went so far as to compare the phenomenon of revelation to the hallucinations of the mentally ill !

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan derived his conception of God from the Deists of 18th century France. To him, God was only a remote abstraction. As the laws of nature are unalterable, he said, not even God can do

anything to change them. Consequently, there is no sense in praying to Him. Such a cold, impersonal Deity could not be expected to take the slightest interest in us.

According to Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the authority of the Quran and the Sunnah is restricted to purely devotional matters. Those verses in the Quran and Hadith dealing with social, economic or cultural affairs reflected only the primitive society in which the Prophet lived and are entirely unsuitable for our enlightened, modern civilization. Therefore, if Muslims are not obliged to follow Islam as a complete way of life, there is nothing to stand in the path of adopting Western culture.

It is obvious that Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan had no genuine interest in a religious revival. The best that could be said for him is that he wanted to promote the social and economic welfare of the Muslim community of India, assuming that the more worldly progress it made, the better off it would be. In so doing, he was utterly blind to the fact that no people in history has ever been able to flourish, even in a material sense, under foreign rule. Mirza Ghulam Ahmad (1839-1908) followed faithfully in the footsteps of his master. In declaring it most desirable to shed one's blood in the cause of British imperialism but condemning Jihad as a crime, he was merely carrying Sayyid Ahmad Khan's ideas to their logical conclusions.

During his exile in India, Jamal ud-Din Afghani (1838-97) became acquainted with Sir Ṣayyid Ahmad Khan and in his *Al-Urwah Al-Wuthqa* had this to say :

> The English authorities saw in Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan a useful instrument to demoralize the Muslims so they began to praise and honour him and helped him build his college at Aligarh and called it the college of the Muslims in order that it be a trap to catch the sons of the believers and spread unbelief among them. Materialists like Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan are even worse than the materialists in Europe for those in Western countries who abandon their religion still retain their patriotism and do not lack zeal to defend their fatherland while Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and his friends represent foreign despotism as acceptable.[2]

The influence of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan upon the Westernizers who came after him cannot be overestimated. His apologetics are faithfully followed to this day. Ameer Ali, Chiragh Ali, Khuda Bakhsh, Ghulam Ahmad Parvez, Khalifa Abdul Hakim and Maulana Muhammad Ali Lahori of the Ahmadiyya movement have scarcely done more than repeat his ideas. Little, if anything, new has been added since.

2. *The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, op. cit.* pp. 117-119.

THE SPIRIT OF UNBELIEF

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE "SPIRIT OF ISLAM" BY AMEER ALI

The Spirit of Islam by Sayyid Ameer Ali is by far the best-known book on the subject in the English-speaking world—so widely read, in fact, that it has attained the prestige of an English classic. Consequently, the majority of English-speaking converts of American and European origin have derived from it a thoroughly distorted conception of Islam. Typical is the comment made by one English convert:

> The book which had most impressed me in my Islamic studies was *The Spirit of Islam* by Sayyid Ameer Ali, although this book is not without some criticism in the Muslim world with regard to many customs and attitudes which the author wished to see reformed. It does, however, put before Muslims and the world as a whole, the true, inspiring grandeur of the faith of Islam which it should surely be the duty of every Muslim to attempt to bring down to the realm of practical life. This is undoubtedly a book which all Muslim students should endeavour to study......
>
> "Quest of the Spirit," Malika Frances Citrine, *The Islamic Review*, Woking, England, January-February-March 1963, p. 17.

The "criticism" it has met in the Muslim world is more than deserved. In fact, no mere criticism is sufficient. If the ulema had been alive to their duty instead of sleeping, the contents of this book should have been denounced as heretical.

Born into a family of the Shi'ah persuasion in 1849, Ameer Ali received his education at Aligarh University

and became a devoted disciple of Sir Sayyid Ahmād Khan. He possessed from his earliest years, unbounded enthusiasm for English culture. In his memoirs, he confesses how "enthralled" he was by Gibbon before he was twelve and by the age of twenty had read most of Shakespeare, Milton, Keats, Byron, Longfellow and other poets along with the novels of Thackery and Scott and "knew Shelley almost by heart." He finally took up the profession of an advocate and lived much of his adult life in London with his English wife until his death in 1928.

The first edition of his famed *Spirit of Islam* was published in London as far back as 1891. Ameer Ali revised and enlarged upon it several times until it attained its present shape in 1922. Ever since then, this book has been undergoing reprint after reprint in America and in England. Portions of it have also been translated into Arabic and Turkish and thus had an appreciable impact upon the modern-educated in those lands. The purpose of *The Spirit of Islam* is to prove that Islam is the most liberal and rational religion—the epitome of "progress" as the modern mind understands it. Polygamy, Purdah and Jihad are thus denounced as against the "true spirit" of the faith. In this way he hoped to attract European converts by equating Islamic values as identical with modern Western ideals.

Most of the first half of *The Spirit of Islam* is taken up with an apology of the life of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) to demonstrate to the Western world that his

character was nothing but sweetness, tenderness, gentleness, forgiveness, mercy and love. Typical of the inferiority-complex inherent in all such apologetic literature is the manner in which he attempts to explain away the Holy Prophet's Jihad against his foes:

> The Koreish army was afield before Mohammed received God's command to do battle to his enemies. He who never in his life had wielded a weapon; to whom the sight of human suffering caused intense pain and pity and who, against all the canons of Arab manliness, wept bitterly at the loss of his children or disciples, whose character remained ever so *tender* and so *pathetic* as to cause his enemies to call him *womanish*—this man was now compelled by the necessities of the situation and *against his own inclinations* to repel the attacks of the enemy by force of arms and to organize his followers for purposes of self-defence...... (pp. 214-218).

Because the author of this work is so vulnerable to Western criticism, the very idea of Jihad is an anathema so he feels compelled to assert that our Holy Prophet did not really want to fight his enemies. Only expediency forced him to do so. The authentic biographies of our Holy Prophet such as the *Sirat Rasul Allah* by Ibn Ishaq and Ibn Hisham and the *Kitab al-Maghazi* by al-Waqidi do not accord with these apologetic conclusions. The eighth and ninth Surahs of our Holy Quran, both consecrated to the subject of Jihad, bear out the utter fallacy of Ameer Ali's apologetics, as under the banner of modernism, he tries to read the present into the past:

> The mind of this remarkable Teacher was, in its *intellectualism* and *progressive* ideals, essentially *modern*. To him the service of humanity was the highest act of devotion

......(p. 121).

The writer insinuates that the Holy Quran is not infallible Divine revelation but merely the result of purely human meditations:

> There is no doubt that in the Suras of the intermediate period before the *mind of the Teacher* had attained the full development *of religious consciousness* and when it was necessary to formulate in language intelligible to the common folk of the desert, the realistic descriptions of heaven and hell, *borrowed from the floating fancies of Zoroastrian, Sabean and Talmudical Jew*, attract the attention as a side picture and then comes the real essence, the adoration of God in humility and love. The hooris are creatures of Zoroastrian origin, so is Paradise, whilst Hell in the severity of its punishment is Talmudic. Probably in the infancy of his religious consciousness Mohammed himself believed in some or other of the traditions which floated around him but with a wider awakening of the soul, a deeper communion with the Creator of the Universe, thoughts which bore a material aspect at first became spiritualised. The *mind of the Teacher progressed* not only with the march of time and the development of his religious consciousness but also with the progress of his disciples in apprehending spiritual conceptions....Virtue for its own sake can only be grasped by minds of superior development; for the average intellect and for the uneducated, sanctions more or less comprehensible will always be necessary......(pp. 197-198).

Ameer Ali connot accept the literal truth of the Hereafter but only its "usefulness as an instrument for the uplifting of the masses." Thus a detailed description of the ancient Zoroastrian concept of the life to come to demonstrate how it influenced the "eclectic faith of Mohammed".

The history of the pious Khalifate is portrayed in conformity with Shi'ah dogma. Consequently, his

unduly harsh criticism of Osman, the third Khalifa.

Osman possessed neither the *shrewdness* of Abu Bakr nor the intellectual vigour and moral fibre of Omar.....The character of the *deluded Pontiff** has been graphically portrayed by Dozy. The personality of Osman did not justify his election to the Caliphate. It is true he was rich and generous, had assisted Mohammed and the religion by pecuniary sacrifices and that he prayed and fasted often and was a man of amiable and soft manners. He was, however, not a man of spirit and was greatly enfeebled by old age. Unhappily for this *old man*, he possessed an inordinate fondness for his kinsmen who formed the Meccan aristocracy and who for twenty years had insulted, persecuted and fought against Mohammed. These were the men whom the Caliph favoured. Complaints poured into Medina from all parts of the Empire. But the complaints were invariably dismissed with *abuses* and *hard words*. A deputation consisting of twelve thousand men headed by Mohammed, the son of the Caliph Abu Bakr, came to the Capital to lay before Osman the grievances of the people and seek redress. Ali persuaded the deputation to depart to their homes by giving them a pledge that their complaints would be redressed. On their way back, they intercepted a letter written by Osman's secretary and which bore the Caliph's own seal, containing a mandate to the *unscrupulous Mu'awiya* to massacre them in a body. Enraged at this *treachery*, they returned to Medina, entered the old Caliph's house and killed him. Osman's death furnished to the Ommeyyads what they were long thirsting for—a plea for the revolt against Islam, against its democracy, its equal rights and its stern rules of morality. ......(pp. 294-295).

This is a blasphemous distortion of history against one of the greatest companions of our Holy Prophet.

---

*Note how Ameer Ali fallaciously compares Hazrat Osman to aRoman Catholic Pope in the most derogatory manner !

Osman committed no treachery. The letter referred to was a *forgery* which Osman himself insisted he had nothing to do with. If Osman (God forbid) were as evil a character as this writer would have us believe, our Holy Prophet would never have included him as among his most beloved companions nor would he have proclaimed him publicly as one of the ten who would go direct to Paradise. Our Holy Prophet declared that Osman would be his constant companion in Paradise. Many other authentic Hadith attest to the virtues of Osman. Having lived with him in closest intimacy for more than twenty years, our Holy Prophet is surely the better judge of Osman's character than this heretical modernist, prejudiced from the outset by his Shi'ah inclinations.

Similarly, the author of this book maligns all our greatest Imams and Mujaddids as responsible for the subsequent decadence of the Muslim world. Here is how he expresses his wrath on Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal:

> The fourth most important *sect of the Sunni Church** was originated by Ibn Hanbal. He flourished during the reigns of Mamun and his successor, Mutasim B'illah. These two Caliphs were Mutazilas. Ibn Hanbal's extreme *fanaticism* and the persistency with which he tried to inflame the *bigotry* of the masses against the sovereigns brought him into trouble with the rulers. Ibn Hanbal and his *patristicism* were responsible for the ill-success of Mamun in introducing the Mutazila doctrines throughout the Empire and for the frequent outbursts of *persecution* which deluged the *Mohammedan* world with the blood of Moslems (p. 352).... Ibn Hanbal—a *red-hot puritan*, breathing eternal perdition to all who differed from him, was shocked with the

*Note that Ameer Ali is so imbued with Christianity that he applies its terminology to Islam. There is no such thing as the "Sunni Church!"

liberalism of Hanafism, and disgusted both with the *exclusive narrowness* of Malikism and the *commonplace* character of Shafeism, applied himself to frame a new system based on traditions for the whole empire. *Abu Hanifa had rejected the majority of Traditions*,* Ibn Hanbal's system included a mass of incongruous, irrational and bewildering stories, the bulk of which are wholly inconsistent with each other and bearing upon their face, *the marks of fabrication*. He denounced learning and science and declared a holy war against Rationalism. The populace carried away by his eloquence, or rather his *vehemence*, took up the cry.... The pulpits began to fulminate brimstone and fire against the upholders of science and reason.. The streets of Bagdad became scenes of frequent rioting and bloodshed. The prime mover of the disturbances was put in prison where he died in the odour of great sanctity.... (pp. 438-439). The theological students, who were chiefly the followers of Ibn Hanbal under the weaker Abbasid Caliphs, became a source of great trouble in Bagdad. They constituted themselves into a body of *irresponsible censors*; they used forcibly to enter homes, break musical instruments and commit similar acts of vandalism.... (p. 487).

And this is how our author justifies the abandonment of all the injunctions of the Shariat as obsolete and opposed to "progress".

The present stagnation of the Musulman communities is principally due to the notion which has fixed itself on the minds of the generality of Moslems that the right to exercise private judgment ceased with the early legists. The Prophet had consecrated reason as the highest and noblest function of the human intellect. Our schoolmen and their followers have made its exercise a sin and a crime. The Moslems of the present day have ignored the spirit in a *hopeless love for the letter*. It was natural that in their

*This is not true.

reverence and admiration for the Teacher, his early disciples should stereotype his ordinary mode of life, crystallise the passing incidents in a *chequered career*, imprint on the heart orders, rules and regulations enunciated for the common exigencies of the day in an *infant society*. But to suppose that the greatest Reformer the world has ever produced, the greatest upholder of the sovereignty of reason, ever contemplated that those injunctions which were called forth by the *passing necessities of a semi-civilised people* should become immutable, is doing an *injustice* to the Prophet of Islam. No one had a keener perception than he of the *necessities of this world of progress* with its *ever-changing social and moral phenomena* nor of the likelihood that the revelations vouchsafed to him might not meet all possible contingencies. No religion contained greater promise of development, no faith was purer or more in conformity with the *progressive demands of humanity*.... (pp. 182-183). What has been laid down by the *Fathers of the Church* is unchangeable and beyond the range of discussion. The Faith may be carried to the land of the Esquimaux but it must go with the rules framed for the guidance of Irakians! (p. 353).

According to Ameer Ali, the "true spirit" of Islam is the Mutazilite heresy whose followers, such as al-Kindi, al-Farabi, Ibn Sina and Ibn Rushd attempted to inject into the bloodstream of Islam, pagan Greek philosophy. Ameer Ali lauds the Mutazilite philosophers as the forerunners, if not the very life-source, of modern Western civilization. Because he blames those Mujaddids, who succeeded in rejecting alien innovations and maintaining an unadulterated Islam, for the demise of the Muslim world, it is clear that what the author is defending is NOT Islam but merely modern Western ideals under the thin disguise of Muslim names.

MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD—THE CHAMPION OF NATIONALISM AND SECULARISM IN MUSLIM INDIA

> The fundamental fallacy of Muslims has been to interpret Islam as a closed system. And that system has been closed not only from outside truth but also from outside people. The fundamental hopefulness about Indian Muslims and therefore Indian Islam is that this community may break through this....It may find the humanity to strive for brotherhood with those of other forms of faith (p. 290)......The question of political power and social organization, so central to Islam, has in the past, always been considered in yes or no terms. Muslims have either had political power or they have not. Never before have they shared it with others....Close to the heart of Islam....has been the conviction that its purpose includes the structuring of a social community, the organization of the Muslim group into a closed body obedient to the Law. It is this conception that seems finally to be proving itself inept in India. (pp. 206-7)
>
> *Islam in Modern History*, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Princeton University Press, 1957.

Thus speaks one of the most prominent Orientalists on the question of the relationship between the Hindus and Muslims of India. The man who would have most whole-heartedly endorsed this fallacious analysis is Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the foremost champion of Hindu-Muslim unity on the basis of modern nationalism and secularism.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad had all the advantages of being raised in a pure Islamic atmosphere. His father, Maulana Muhammad Khairuddin, was a

learned scholar, the author of many books of Arabic and Persian who was revered by thousands of disciples from all parts of India. After the rebellion against British rule was crushed in 1857, the Maulana's father was one of the thousands who fled his native Delhi for his life. As soon as arrangements could be made by his trusted disciples, he went to Arabia and took refuge in Mecca. There he married the daughter of one of the most pious and esteemed divines of the city—a woman of high intelligence and also an Arabic scholar. From this union Abul Kalam was born in 1888. Since his mother knew no other tongue, Arabic was his native language. For his elementary education he was not sent to any school but learned from his mother and father and the Arabic scholars who were his father's friends. In 1898, at the urgent request of a disciple, his father finally returned to India and settled in Calcutta. Here under private tutors the boy pursued a full course of Arabic and Persian, philosophy, logic, arithmetic, geography and history which ordinarily required fourteen years to complete. So brilliant was the young Abul Kalam, that he finished the course in less than four years. His father, realising the menace and evil of British imperialism, was a most implacable foe of modern Western civilization and everything it stood for. The English education and modernist interpretation of Islam propagated by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan was an anathema to him.

Abul Kalam Azad was a genuine prodigy. When he was only twelve years old, he expressed his desire to write a biography of Imam al-Ghazzali. By the

age of sixteen he was revered as a learned *Alim*. In his spare time he composed poetry in Urdu of no mean artistic merit and at the tender age of fourteen made his name in journalism by founding the *Lisanus Sidq* (The Voice of Truth). In 1904 when he was barely sixteen he was invited by the *Anjuman-i-Himayat-i-Islam* society in Lahore to deliver the annual address. The topic of his lecture was "The Rational Basis of Religion." His audience included such celebrities as the Urdu prose-writer Nazir Ahmad and the poets, Hali and Allama Iqbal. So impressive was his speech that this occasion made a name for him all over India. The poet Hali described him as "an old head on young shoulders."

Already during this period of his middle and late adolescence he pondered over what he would do with his life. Uppermost in his mind was the future of Islam and how he could help his brethren-in-faith. Thus in 1912 when he was barely twenty-four he launched his career by founding "*Al-Hilal*" (The Crescent), a weekly illustrated Urdu periodical which in its call for pan-Islamic unity and its vehement criticism of the sinister designs of British imperialism throughout the Muslim world was strongly reminiscent of Jamal-ud-Din Afghani's "*Al Urwah al Wuthqa* ." Here in the medium of journalism, Abul Kalam Azad proved himself a man of first-rate literary talent. In this magazine with the most persuasive eloquence, he campaigned vehemently against the Aligarh movement of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and all that it stood for. He argued against modern education and Westernization in any form. When somebody asked him whether he

followed the extremist or the moderate school of Indian politics, he ridiculed the very idea of a Muslim following others in any matter. They were the chosen people of God and had their path clearly pointed out to them. So far as he was concerned, he insisted that he followed nothing but the Holy Quran and urged all his co-religionists to do the same. This led to an unprecedented upsurge of enthusiasm for an Islamic revival throughout the country and henceforth the apologetic attitude of Sayyid Ahmad Khan and his efforts to make Islam conform to modern philosophy lost their appeal. Before *Al Hilal* was banned by the British and Abul Kalam Azad sent to prison, its circulation had climbed to twenty-five thousand.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's release from prison in 1920 marked the turning point in his life. It was at this juncture when he completely reversed his religious views and henceforth the future of the Muslim community as such was not his concern. He was no longer interested in building a true Islamic society in India but instead championed Hindu-Muslim unity for the aims of secular nationalism. "I am one of those who believe that revivalism may be a necessity in a religion," he said, "*but in social matters it is a denial of progress!*"

> Uptill 1920-1921 Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was an enthusiastic exponent of Islamic revival and the Khilafat movement, but afterwards he turned a complete somersault, in thought and action; so much so that many people began to rub their eyes to make sure whether he was the same Azad or by some process of metamorphosis, a new person had been born within him. Abul Kalam Azad was now a hundred per cent Indian nationalist and a

vociferous protagonist of a single Indian nationhood of Muslims and non-Muslims. He assimilated the so-called theory of unity of religions expounded by some Hindu philosophers and the Western theory of biological evolution. The imprint of these theories can clearly be seen in his commentary on the Holy Quran.

(Quoted from Maulana Abul Ala Maudoodi's personal letter to me dated March 30, 1962)

Convinced that salvation of the Muslims of India depended upon their acceptance of nationalism and secularism, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad joined the Indian National Congress Party and became one of the closest associates of Mahatma Gandhi.

"For the purposes of liberation of India and the present agitation," he declared, "I entirely agree with all the arguments of Mahatma Gandhi and I have complete confidence in his honesty. It is my definite conviction that India cannot attain success by force of arms nor is it advisable for it to adopt that course. India can only triumph through non-violent agitation and India's triumph will be a memorable example of the victory of moral force."[1]

After Mahatma Gandhi called off the Khilafat movement in 1922 and failed to check the communal disturbances which claimed thousands of Muslim lives, the majority of the Muslim members of the Congress such as Maulana Muhammad Ali, his brother, Shaukat Ali and the Qaid-e-Azam became increasingly disillusioned and, one by one, they resigned from the Party. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, however, not

1. Mahadev Desai, *Maulana Abul Kalam Azad*, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1941, p. 82.

only stayed on, but became, as its President for nearly two decades, its most ardent defender at all costs.

"Mr. Jinnah charges that the policy of the Congress is decidedly anti-Muslim, that it wants to destroy Muslim culture, constantly interferes with the Muslim religious and social life and always tramples down the political and economic rights of the Muslims. I have often declared before and I again do the same with all responsibility that all these accusations against the Congress ministries are absolutely baseless. It is a mountain of falsehood to say that the policy of Congress is anti-Muslim and has been trampling down the religious, political and economic rights of the Muslims. If Mr. Jinnah and his colleagues think that they are saying these things to benefit the cause of the Muslims, I would tell them in all earnestness that they are doing quite the opposite thing and they do a true service to the Muslims of India if they change their direction as early as possible, a true service for which the Indian Muslims are in the greatest need today." [2]

After independence in 1947, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad became the Indian Minister for Education until his death in 1958. Far from making the least attempt to base the education for Indian Muslims on a genuine Islamic foundation, he favoured such Westernising ideas as the adoption of the Latin alphabet for Urdu and the other Indian languages. He also supported the Government-sponsored campaign for family planning.

2. Desai, op. cit., pp. 152-155.

"Birth control is a purely social and biological problem," he said, "and there is no reason why the Islamic law should interfere with it. If the experts feel that it is a must for the nation, they may give their verdict in its favour."[3]

No Muslim leader in India opposed the creation of Pakistan more than Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. In so doing he justified his stand by declaring:

"The Muslim League proposal for Pakistan is fantastic. Those who make this proposal are flying in the face of history, ethnology, and the tendency of modern times. When they say that the Hindus and Muslims are two separate nations, they beg the question. The ancestors of most of us were common and I for one do not accept the theory of a superior or inferior race or different races. Mankind is one race and we have to live in harmony with one another. Providence brought us together over a thousand years ago. We have fought but so do blood-brothers fight. So did Englishmen fight Englishmen in the War of the Roses. But they never insisted on living as separate nations. During this one thousand years we have reacted upon one another to our mutual spiritual, cultural, moral and material benefit. Mr. Jinnah and his sympathizers in the Muslim League want to put the hands of the clock back by centuries. It is no use trying to emphasize differences. Every lover of peace must emphasize similarities. What I detest is the communal approach to the national problem. In a future Constitution determined by India's representa-

---

3. Abu Shehab Rafi Ullah, "Islam and Family Planning," *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, December 2, 1966.

tives, the Hindu and the Muslim will have to think of their position and interests not as a Hindu or a Muslim but as a peasant or a zamindar, as a labourer or a capitalist and so on......"[4]

In his fervent conviction that serving the ends of secular nationalism should take precedence over the concept of the Islamic community, he used all the ingenuity of his erudite mind to attempt to provide religious justification for his actions.

"Why should the Muslims join hands with the Hindus in the political struggle of the country? The Quran has permitted the Muslims to marry Jewish and Christian women where the husband shall love his wife and no other tie shall be dearer to him than that one. Then if the Quran does not allow the Muslims to have any contact at all with the non-Muslim, how is it possible to permit Muslims to make non-Muslims the very queens of their homes and put within their charge their entire worldly affairs? Herein lies the key to Hindu-Muslim unity."[5]

Such apologetics are really astounding from a learned *Alim*. The permission granted for a Muslim to marry outside his faith is confined only to the Jews and the Christians—the "People of the Scriptures". The Holy Quran forbids a Muslim to marry from among the polytheists which the Hindus undoubtedly are. The permission for a Muslim to marry outside his faith is only granted on condition that the husband is the head of the household and the children will be reared

---

4. Desai, op, cit., pp. 170-171.

5. A. B. Rajput, *Maulana Abul Kalam Azad*, Lion Press, Lahore, 1957, p. 40.

as Muslims. Again and again, the Holy Quran insists that Muslims befriend only believers and warns that whoever takes unbelievers for friends in preference to believers, commits a great sin. No two religions conflict with each other more than the polytheism of Hinduism and the monotheism of Islam, and the Maulana ignores the fact that never can there be unity between peoples possessing no common ideals.

As an example of the extravagant lengths to which the Maulana was willing to go in order to serve the ends of secular nationalism, he called upon the Muslims of India to remember that the Hindus were offended by their slaughter of cows for food and particularly the sacrifice of cows on the Eid day. For the sake of Hindu-Muslim unity, he asked the Muslims to remember that cow-slaughter, even for purposes of sacrifice, is not a fundamental part of their religion and he likewise assured his Hindu friends that there were many Muslims who not only never tasted beef themselves but were trying to reduce the use of it among their comrades "if only to show their spirit of brotherliness with the Hindus." In the near future, he hoped that both the Hindus and the Muslims would relax such taboos which kept their two communities apart.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad's most celebrated work in which he sought religious justification for his activities, is his incomplete Urdu commentary on the Holy Quran. His main thesis in this work is that all religions are equally valid and it is only their followers who have drifted astray. He insisted that all religions in the world are united in essence, "They differ not

in their roots but in the leaves and branches, not in the spirit but only in the outward form or body. Ceremonials and rituals will vary and continue to vary with the age and country, but God in His wisdom has deliberately created this diversity. Religion is all one; only outward forms of ritual and ceremonial differ and everyone thinks that his way is superior to that of others. He cannot look at his own way from the point of view of his opponents. But even as your way is excellent in your own eye, so in other people's eyes their way is excellent. Toleration is therefore the only solution."[6]

The concept that all religions are equally true is a Hindu idea which finds no place in the Holy Quran where it is clearly stated in no uncertain terms that whoever follows a way of life other than Islam shall not be accepted by God for salvation.

> The Muslims of India in fact face what is a radically new and profound problem; namely, how to live with others as equals....Yet it is a question on which the past doctrines of Islam offer no immediate guidance. And it is, of course, in this particular case immensely complicated by the discouraging fact that the caste Hindus with whom they must live, have not yet learned to live with others either. (p. 288)....It is our conviction that the welfare of the Muslim community of India, both mundane and spiritual, lies in its creatively participating in the life of the new nation....It is our observation that it has moved in this direction during the past five years despite all troubles. Of the various factors contributing to this, the chief has been the success of secularism. That success has, of course, been partial but basic. Not much reflection is needed.... to realise that the survival and welfare of the Muslim com-

6. Desai, op. cit., pp. 104-105.

> munity depend squarely on the secularity of the state. The full theological implications of this are as yet far from worked out. Relatively few Muslims, (however, in India) seem to have clung to the Islamic state idea.... Whatever traditional theology may say, secularism works. (p. 281)....
> *Islam in Modern History*, op. cit.

In the years since the above quotation was penned, events in India have proved the fallaciousness of such wishful thinking. Secularism has *not* worked.[7] On the contrary, the "secular" state has subjected the Muslims of India, particularly in occupied Kashmir, to wholesale persecution and genocide. The course followed by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad has led the Muslim community of India to ruin and disaster. How tragic it is that he could not foresee that as an inevitable result of his futile attempt to cooperate and befriend the Hindu majority in order to free India from British rule, the Muslim community has merely exchanged one bondage for another!

---

7. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad left behind him a dedicated band of Muslim quislings such as *Chagla*, ex-Foreign Minister who when Minister for Education carried on a fierce campaign to persuade his Government to abolish the Muslim personal law, ban polygamy, Purdah and sanction the civil marriage of a Muslim girl to a non-Muslim husband which is prohibited by the Shariah. To promote the national family planning programme, he publicly spoke out in favour of legalizing abortion and making sterilization compulsory for fathers with more than three children. In the heat of the Indo-Pak War (September 6-24, 1965) in a speech over All-India Radio, he boasted of his Hindu ancestry. He then pointed out that most Pakistani Muslims are Hindus racially and ought to be proud of it ! In an extravagant effort to please his Hindu overlords, when *Dr. Zakir Hussain* assumed the Presidency, he delivered his inaugural address in Sanskrit, afterwards paying his homage to a well-known Hindu holy man by garlanding him with flowers and kissing his feet. His granddaughter now intends to marry Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's son and he fully approves. He is also reported to be partial to the worship of the Hindu god, *Vishnu*. The so-called Muslim Chief Minister of Pondicherry, M. O. H. Faruq, made a statement in the Tamil weekly, *Kalkandu*, of August 24, 1967 that an "unknown extraordinary power" induced him to worship the Hindu god, Lord Muruga that has won his heart and he added that he wishes to raise his son to worship this god. Other Indian periodicals were quick to point out that "a change of heart is taking place in many enlightened and progressive Muslims and that the Chief Minister of Pondicherry is a worthy example ! " *Sadiq*, the Prime Minister of Kashmir, is known to cooperate openly with the Fascist *Jana Sangh* Party for the genocide of the Kashmiri Muslims. This is Indian secularism in practice!

A MODERN APPROACH TO ISLAM*

The present work under review has been chosen not because its author is particularly significant as a personality but because the ideas expressed in this book are so typical of the mentality of our modern-educated elite.

Born into an Ismaili Shi'ah family in 1899, Asaf Fyzee received an exclusively English education at Christian missionary schools and colleges. From 1949-1951 he served as Ambassador of India to Egypt. He was Vice-Chancellor (1957-1960) at the University of Jammu and Kashmir and at present he is visiting professor at St. John's College in Cambridge.

According to Professor Fyzee, the plight of "this Arabian faith" demands the choice of one of three alternatives; (1) either we must mould our lives in conformity to Islam; (2) we must interpret Islam as compatible with twentieth-century life; (3) or we can abandon Islam altogether. Although Professor Fyzee is verbally emphatic in his opposition to the latter course "because I believe that Islam properly understood has much to offer to the human spirit in the world of today," we shall soon understand why his choice of the second alternative must inevitably lead to the third.

In his first chapter, entitled "The Essence of Islam," the author endeavours to enlighten his readers on the question: What does Islam stand for? This he attempts to do by a brief summary of Maulana Abul

*Asaf Ali Asghar Fayzee (Faydi), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963,

Kalam Azad's commentary of the *Fatihah** in his incomplete *Tarjuman ul-Quran*. He is in accord with Maulana Abul Kalam Azad that "all religions are equally true but people differ in ritual and custom ...... and the best part of faith is to serve human beings and practise tolerance........." (p. 24)

The author devotes his second chapter, "Law and Religion in Islam" to a fervent plea for a complete separation of the two. "The theory that law is God-made is in the language of the law a *legal fiction*, the main object of which is to create a moral sanction of the highest efficacy for what in effect is nothing more than a legal norm......Older nations not imbued with sufficient discipline and social sense to obey the law for its own sake, introduced the element of fear by retribution or of joy by promise of divine favors to secure implicit obedience to the law........" (p. 3) Consequently in this fashion, the author argues that divinely-revealed laws are necessary only for peoples in a primitive stage of moral and social development and that secular man-made legal systems are the sign of a mature and advanced civilization. "The sources of law and religion being the same (in Islam), the fusion is complete; the lessons of history, the changing conditions of society, the ever-varying pattern of civilization and the evolutionary process in the economic structure of the modern world have not been taken into consideration sufficiently by the Shariah and the result is that by and large Islamic law remains backward and undeveloped in many parts of the world......" (p. 37) In order to undermine the authenticity of the founda-

*The *Fatihah* is the first Sura of Holy Quran.

tions of the Shariah, Asaf Fyzee, on the sole authority of hostile Western "Orientalists", attempts to cast doubts in the minds of his readers as to the validity of Hadith and Sunnah as the basis of Islamic law. "In particular, the recent work of Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford, 1950), tells us with a convincing array of evidence that *Sunnah, the second source of the Law, represents the opinions of the learned in Damascus rather than the inspired words or example of the Prophet.* It is indeed beyond the scope of this paper to deal with Schacht's theory but it will be sufficient to say that *his work merits the highest consideration........*" (p. 44)

The third chapter, "Islamic Law and Theology" endeavours to summarize the important ideas and accomplishments of the most brilliant Indian Muslim scholars and reformers during recent centuries in his efforts to "apply 20th century legal and historical principles to the formation of a modern critique of the Shariah" (p. 58). He praises Shah Waliullah (1703-1762) as "thoroughly modern in his outlook" (p. 69), and asserts that Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the founder of the modernist school in India, cooperated with the British" only to the end that his backward community may rise by taking the fullest advantage of an English education which to him was the gateway to European thought," rejected the authority of the Hadith and Sunnah as "restricting the meaning of the real faith" and that Muslims must rely on the "Holy Quran alone as interpreted in the light of modern Western science and philosophy as the one and only source of inspiration" (p. 71). He characterizes Sir Muhammad Iqbal

as chiefly influenced by German philosophy of the 19th century. Above all others, the author admires Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (1888-1958) and his pet theory that since all religions are equally true and Islam is so tolerant and eclectic, Muslims can freely borrow from any of them as they please, his modern "scientific" attitude, his collaboration with Mahatma Gandhi, his fervent devotion to the cause of Indian secular nationalism and equally vehement opposition to the creation of Pakistan. (pp. 78-81)

Professor Fyzee concludes his chapter as follows:

> By importing legislation on modern lines, they (the British) made a great advance on the previous administration of justice (in India) (p. 59)......What we have to face is that a Muslim living in a secular or a modern state must have the freedom and independence to obey fresh laws and new legal norms whether (compatible) with the Shariah or not (p. 62)......It is the writer's conviction that gradually all individual and personal laws based upon ancient principles governing the social life of the community will either be abolished or so modified as to bring them within a general scheme of laws applicable to all persons regardless of religious differences. This movement (in India) is already strong in subjects....such as that pertaining to civil marriage and divorce. Such gradual modifications even of the rules of the Shariah do not destroy the essential truth of the faith of Islam. On a truer and deeper examination of the matter, it will be found that certain portions of the Shariah constitute only an outer crust which encloses a kernel—the central core of Islam—which can be preserved intact only by reinterpretation and restatement in every age and in every epoch of civilization. The responsibility to determine afresh what are the durable and what the changeable elements in Islam are, rests on us at the present time. The conventional theology of the Ulema does not

satisfy the minds and the outlook of the present century." (pp. 82-3)

At this stage, several questions have inevitably arisen in the reader's mind the most crucial of which are: 1) Specifically what does Professor Fyzee consider the "eternal, unchanging truths of Islam"—the kernel as opposed to the husk which he is so eager for Muslims to discard as no longer of value; 2). By what criteria and on the basis of what authority or sanction does the author attempt to distinguish between the former and the latter? 3) What can we as Muslims expect as the results of such radical surgery? The author's reply is his fourth and concluding chapter, "The Reinterpretation of Islam."

Although Professor Fyzee does not hesitate to dub himself as "unorthodox" or "unconventional," he most emphatically declares that *he and those who sympathize with him must be accepted just as true Muslims as those who adhere to the "external trappings and traditionalism."* "I believe in a religion according to my own lights, not according to the traditional views." (p. 89) "The perplexing details, the meaningless ritual and the soulless formulas leave me cold. I refuse to regard the existing formulation of faith as either beneficial or true in the world of today." (p. 91)

Here is a concise summary of the author's "reinterpretation of Islam" in his own words:

1. "The process of evolution is coterminous with human society. Nothing is static except that which is dead and lifeless .... Since law is by nature subject to change and the Shariah is both religion and law, the two conflict with each other. Therefore they must be

separated once and for all. For example, the Shariah prohibits the giving or receiving of interest but because interest is the basis of modern economy, Muslims must abandon this injunction as obsolete (p. 88). We must distinguish between universal moral rules enjoined by all religions such as truthfulness, marital purity, honesty, etc. and the specific laws peculiar to Islam such as the prohibition of alcoholic beverages and swine-flesh. The first category is of eternal validity while the latter is not (p. 99). Since the essential faith of man is something different from the outward observance of rules, the inner life of the spirit—the "idea of the Holy"—must be separated to some extent from the outward forms of social behaviour" (p. 99). Thus modern secular legal systems must be accepted on principle by Muslims, however much they may conflict with the Shariah (p. 100) and that the futile attempt to plant an Islamic theocracy in any modern state or fashion life after the pattern of early Islam is doomed to failure" (p. 108).

2. "What is the present state of the (Shariah)? How far does it fall short of the highest norms fixed by modern juristic thinking? In what way can the rules be sustained, amended or repealed so as to conform with modern concepts of social justice and to promote the social well-being of the Muslim community as an *integral part of society in general*? (p. 104)

3. The ethical and theological values of Islam should be reshaped by the teachings of such modern Western philosophers as Tillich, Kierkegaarde and Buber as well as the great advances made by Protestant thinkers from Martin Luther onwards and the speculations of all Hindu, Buddhist, Jewish and Christian

thinkers of note. Muhammad was a genuine Messenger of God but no greater than any of the other religious teachers of the world (p. 110).

4. Since no human language can be understood in its original form for more than five or ten thousand years, the Arabic Quran as revealed to our Holy Prophet must eventually become totally incomprehensible and replaced by translations (pp. 93-94). "Therefore to me it is clear that we cannot go *back* to the Quran; we have to go *forward* with it. I wish to understand the Quran......only to interpret it and apply it to my conditions of life and to believe in it *so far as it appeals to me as a 20th-century man* (p. 94). "For instance, great emphasis need not be laid on the virgin birth of Jesus or the descriptions of Heaven and Hell in the Quran. *The literal truth need not be (accepted)*. The spiritual beauty of fasting (*i.e.* Ramadan) can be appreciated without insisting on its "hidebound prescriptions" (p. 101). I believe in the Islamic form of prayer but not in prescribing and enforcing *a soulless ritual which has no meaning left in modern life*" (p. 111). The Quranic verse, "Men are in charge of women because God hath made one of them to excel the other," (4: 34) should be reinterpreted as purely local and applicable only for the time being......and no longer appropriate in modern life (pp.103-104).

5. "True Islam cannot thrive without freedom of thought in every single matter, in every single doctrine, in every single dogma. Just as Luther broke down the barriers of dogma in Christianity and asserted the right of individual interpretation and progressive Judaism has sought to bring a reformed religion to the Jews, so

also must *liberal Islam* be officially recognized and accepted. "**My faith is** *my own*, **a faith fashioned by my own outlook on life, by my own philosophy, my own experience, my own intuition. I give to every Muslim and indeed, to every man, the right to fashion his own faith** (p. 107).

Throughout his book Professor Fyzee bestows a flowery tribute upon the Islamic heritage, as he describes how profoundly moved he is by the masterpieces of Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Urdu literature, the magnificent architecture, craftsmanship and poetry; the superb hospitality and exquisite courtesy of cultured Muslims the world over (p. 111). "Islam emphasizes truth, beauty and goodness, the Platonic values. As to truth, few civilizations have served human advancement and progress as Islam has" (p. 112). However, because the author repudiates the very society and culture which alone made these accomplishments possible, all his professed reverence for the Islamic heritage is mere verbalism. After stripping Islam of almost everything, what is left in its "eternal core of sacred principles" but mere belief in a God? And by denying His eternal guidance for humanity as obsolete, what an emasculated God indeed! As for truth, beauty and goodness, what more are they than empty platitudes when the means Islam prescribes for attaining these virtues are rejected?

Now to return to the original and most important question raised by this book: What *does* Islam stand for? The answer requires no philosophical sophistry or pretensions to vast erudition as Professor Fyzee has attempted to impress upon his readers. Its literal defi-

nition is sufficient as much for the scholar as for the illiterate. Islam means none else than whole-hearted unquestioning *submission* to the will of God. In other words, we can either go God's way or our own way. If we go our own way and follow our own desires and impulses, then we are nothing more than Kafirs, pure and simple. Only those who go God's way by obeying the Holy Quran and the Sunnah in their entirety as infallible Divine guidance, can rightfully claim to be Muslims. One need not read beyond the first paragraph of this book to know which alternative the author has chosen.

"ISLAM" MINUS SUNNAH: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE WORK OF GHULAM AHMAD PARVEZ*

The most apt commentary on the ideas of Ghulam Ahmad Parvez was summarized by the late Christian Arab orientalist, Nabih Amin Faris, when he wrote; "The modernists and apologists read into the Quran those ideas of Western culture which have found their way into their minds. In so doing, they have invariably violated the norms and dictates of historical interpretation."**

Ghulam Ahmad Parvez is a faithful follower of the old Aligarh apologetic school. He has inherited the legacy of modernism bequeathed to him by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Chiragh Ali and Syed Amir Ali. Born in the Punjab in 1903, he received his earliest education under the guidance of his grandfather, who was a respected Sufi, and after specializing in oriental languages, he took his degree from Punjab University. Typical of so many modernists in Muslim countries, he has worked as a Government servant all his adult life, both under British rule and since Partition when he was employed as Assistant Secretary to the Pakistani Government. In recent years, he retired from service and now devotes most of his time to his "research"

**Islam: A Challenge to Religion*, Ghulam Ahmad Parvez, Idara-e-Tulu-e-Islam, Lahore, 1968.

**Quoted from *The Islamic Literature*, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, July 1956, p. 12.

centre, Idara-e-Tulu-e-Islam, which aims to spread his modernism to every corner of the land.

From 1941 to 1949 he wrote and published his four-volume Urdu Quranic commentary, *Maarif ul-Quran*, which in its rejection of the validity and authenticity of the Hadith and Sunnah and the alleged necessity to submit all Islamic beliefs and practices to conform to the norms of contemporary thought, bears a striking resemblance to the writings of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan on the same subjects. He is also known among the Pakistani intelligentsia for his Arabic lexicon, *Mahfum ul-Quran* which he wants to render into English. *Islam: A Challenge to Religion* is his first and only work in English. Although educated Pakistanis are well-acquainted with the Urdu works of Parvez, except for the attention he has received by a few Western orientalists, he is almost unknown beyond the borders of this country. Now he writes in English, hoping for a warm reception from a wider and more cosmopolitan audience.

Islam: A Challenge to Religion is a dangerous book for the impressionable, immature minds of high school and college youth. Faithful to the *raison d'etre* of modernism, all Islamic concepts are translated in terms of contemporary thought to make the work as attractive as possible to the Western mentality. In the process, the author has no scruples whatsoever about sacrificing the last remnants of intellectual honesty.

The theme of the book is the author's sharp distinction between *Mudhab* which he translates as "religion" and *din* or the faith of Islam. According to him, religion is synonymous with priesthood, theocracy,

monasticism, asceticism, celibacy, mysticism and private communion with the Divine in seeking the individual's salvation while *Din* is a dynamic code of life revealed to all mankind by God through the Quran. At the outset, he has confused the reader with the meaning of the word, *Mudhab*, which has always been understood by the *ulama* to mean a sect or school of thought like the Ahl-i-Bait, Ahl-i-Hadith or Ahl-i-Sunnah. Even the different orthodox schools of Muslim law—Hanafi, Shafi, Maliki and Hanbali—are often referred by the *ulama* as the four *Mudhab*. This being the case, how can the word *Mudhab* be explained as the antonym of *Din*? The appropriate word for the perversions of religion, as described by the author, is not *Mudhab* but *Rabbaniyat* ! Since the author is well-aware that those who read his book will have little knowledge of Islam and no acquaintance whatsoever with Arabic, he feels confident that he will not be brought to account by misleading the minds of his admirers in this way.

Nowhere has the Quran suffered a more mutilated and distorted interpretation than by the pen of Parvez. Thanks to the influence of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, all miracles and supernatural beings like devils, angels and *djinn* are explained away in such an outrageous manner that the very meaning of the Text is violated. Paradise and Hell are not places but merely states of mind; angels are only "the forces of nature" and although Satan is described in the Quran as an actual being and Muslims everywhere have always accepted without question that literal meaning, accord-

ing to Parvez, Satan represents rebellious and defiant men or only the evil forces within a man.

In distinguishing between *Madhab* and *Din*, Parvez writes :

> *Mudhab* frowns and sneers at all things of art and beauty while *Din* defies those who forbid the enjoyment of the good and beautiful things of life which God has created for the enjoyment of man. (p. 369)

The fact is that all the other religions (*i.e.*, Hinduism, Buddhism and Christianity) have been the greatest patrons of art in history. The only faiths which ever denounced picture, statue and instrumental music are Judaism and Islam. Thus in this context, his distinction between *Mudhab* and *Din* is meaningless.

> *Mudhab* denounces everything new and declares all innovation as sin while *Din* holds that the needs and demands of human life keep changing with the change in the conditions of life ; change and innovation are therefore demanded by life itself. Only the Divine laws are immutable. (*ibid.*)

This is completely contrary to fact. The fact is that every religion except Islam has welcomed constant innovation in its beliefs, practices and mode of worship. From the philosophical, moral and theological standpoint, the most flexible of all religions is Hinduism which is ready to include among its adherents, mystics, pantheists, deists and even atheists! Jews and Christians are now accepting every kind of innovation including jazz music and rock roll dancing during their services of worship and in conformity to the prevailing permissive moral atmosphere, the highest religious dignitaries of Christendom are ready to condone homosexuality and pre-marital sex. The Quran repeatedly warns us

that whoever accepts a way of life not sanctioned by Islâm will not attain salvation and the Holy Prophet is recorded in the most authentic Hadith to have declared that nothing is more hateful to God than *bidat* —innovation! The Holy Prophet even went so far as to condemn the innovators as apostates doomed to Hell-fire! The purpose of Islam is not to "keep abreast of the times" but to force the "simes" into conformity with its teachings based upon absolute, transcendental law and morality. In preaching "Islam" minus Sunnah, Parvez is asking for the impossible.

The bulk of the book is devoted to showing how the Quran can solve the problems facing the modern age. After Communism, Capitalism, secular Democracy and Scientific Materialism have failed to check the moral degeneration of contemporary society, Parvez offers Islam as the panacea. He thus discourses at length on the necessity of man to accept Divine guidance and permanent values as embodied in the Quran and apply those principles to the arena of government, politics, economics, war and the question of the place of woman in society.

Much more significant than what the book has to say about these subjects is what it doesn't say.

The most glaring omission is any mention of Hadith and Sunnah. The views of Parvez concerning the Hadith are well known to the literate Urdu-speaking world. In all his Urdu writings, he denounces the Hadith as pious forgery (God forbid) and refuses to accept the Traditions as the most valid interpretation of the Quran. Yet the Quran itself repeatedly exhorts

the believers to follow the example of the Holy Prophet and what else does this mean except the Hadith? Therefore to denounce the Hadith is tantamount to a rejection of the guidance of the Quran. The Quran provides the general outlines of belief and practice but the Hadith, being much more explicit, fill in all the details. Without the Hadith, how would we know how to make *wudhu* and perform our *Salat*? How would we know upon whom Zakat is due and how much? Where else than Hadith can we find adequate instructions on how to make *Haj* or celebrate the Eid al-Fitr and the Eid al-Adha? If the Hadith as a whole are repudiated as unreliable, where else can we attain authentic information about the Holy Prophet and the *Sahabah*? Who is to replace the Holy Prophet? Is it not the height of blasphemy to proclaim the Quran as the supreme source of Guidance for the human race while at the same time rejecting the Prophet to whom it was revealed as unfit to interpret it? If the sources of the Traditions are so defective, as Ghulam Ahmad Parvez would have us think, how can such an emasculated faith provide the human race with a sound code of life? Who would be prepared to struggle and make sacrifices for such watered-down modernism?

In contrast to his Urdu works, in this English book, he makes no attempt to refute or condemn the Hadith. He solves the whole problem by conveniently ignoring it altogether as unworthy of any attention! Thus this book is conspicuous by the poverty of any reference to incidents in the life of the Holy Prophet. Even the *Sahabah* are hardly mentioned! The spiritual life of

Islam is discussed with hardly any reference to Salat or fasting on Ramadan. *Haj* receives only a brief paragraph or two. The chapter on "Quranic" economics contains no mention of Zakat! The chapter on war has nothing to say about *Jihad*! The chapter on women says nothing whatsoever about *Purdah* or the necessity for the segregation of the sexes. Law is discussed without any reference to the *Shariah* and the chapters devoted to politics and government have nothing to say about the *Khalifat*! In discussing politics, he never cares to cite any of our great rulers like Abu Bakr, Umar Ibn Khattab, Uthman, Ali, Umar Abdul Aziz, Salah-ud-Din Ayubi, Alamgir Aurangzeb; Sayyid Ahmad Shahid, Haider Ali or Sultan Tippu. Thus by ignoring it as unworthy of any notice, Ghulam Ahmad Parvez rejects Islamic history along with Islamic institutions. Characteristically, Parvez chooses to overlook all Islamic scholarship as well. His bibliography is remarkable in that it includes only English books by American and European philosophers and orientalists. Not a single work in Arabic, Persian, Turkish or Urdu by a reputable Alim or Muslim writer is listed except the Urdu books by himself!

What is left after this radical amputation? What are the "permanent Divine values" Parvez thinks are valid for the modern world? He lists them as follows: (1) respect for humanity in general; (2) unity in humanity; (3) responsibility; (4) freedom of conscience; (5) free-well; (6) tolerance; (7) justice; (8) the right of all human beings for the necessities of physical subsistence and mental development; (9) chastity;

(10) aesthetic taste and respect for the fine arts; (11) the belief that man is the master of the universe and able to subdue and harness the forces of nature to his advantage.

Almost any liberal is the West, subscribing to agnostic or even atheist humanism, could wholeheartedly endorse these vague and abstract platitudes. All his criticism of the evils of Western civilization has no value because he rejects as "traditionalist, medieval, conventional Islam" the only antidote to the poison. This book, along with the other works by Ghulam Ahmad Parvez, has nothing whatever to do with Islam as the vast majority of Muslims throughout the world have always understood and practiced it. If Ibn Hanifa, Shafi, Malik or Hanbal could return to life and read this book, in amazement they would exclaim; "What novel philosophy!"

AN EXAMPLE OF THE INFLUENCE OF ORIENTALISM UPON CONTEMPORARY MUSLIM SCHOLARSHIP

The most astonishing development of the modernist movement has been the increasing readiness of certain Muslim scholars, under the slogan of "Islamic research," to accept without question the validity and justification of all attempts by Orientalists to undermine the foundations of Islamic beliefs and practices. One of the most prominent of these Orientalists, H. A. R. Gibb in his *Modern Trends in Islam* (Chicago University Press, 1945), deplored the failure of the modernists to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the Holy Quran and Hadith, with the same methods of "Higher Criticism" Christian skeptics have already done with the Bible, in order to make an attempt to "prove" that the Holy Quran was of human origin and not Divine revelation! The primary goal of modern Orientalism is to incite Muslim-named scholars through this pseudo-scientific "research" to dare assert that our Holy Quran and Hadith is either of composite origin and not even revealed to the Holy Prophet or that the Holy Quran, like the Bible and the scriptures of other religions, has undergone change and modification with the passage of time! If this proves to be impossible (which it must be), then the Orientalists would like the Muslim-named scholars at least to distinguish between the strictly historical parts of our holy books which they allege were meant solely for the primitive Arabian society of the Prophet's day and, consequently, irrelevant for the

present age, and the eternal moral principles of universal application. Thus if, under the influence of Orientalism, Muslim-named scholars could come to regard the, Holy Quran as merely a book like any other book full of errors or that at best its specific injunctions were intended only for a particular time and place, God forbid, it would automatically lose all of its authority and eventually cease to command any obedience or even respect. Syed Ameer Ali's *Spirit of Islam* (1922) and Dr. Taha Hussain's *On Pre-Islamic Poetry* (1926) were first attempts. Dr. Fazlur Rahman's most recent book on *Islam* (Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1966) has clearly pointed in the same direction. He writes:

> ......Now the view of the Prophet and the prophetic revelation that the level of his consciousness was 'normal' was something encouraged and indeed *explicitly formulated by orthodoxy much later*. This was supposed to guarantee the externality of the Angel (Gabriel) or the Voice in the interests of safeguarding the 'objectivity' of the revelation. The attempt may seem to us intellectually immature, but at the time *when the dogma was in the making*, there were compelling reasons for taking this step, particularly the controversies against the rationalists. A great deal of Hadith, *commonly accepted later, came into existence* portraying the Prophet talking to the Angel in public and graphically describing the appearance of the latter....This idea of the externality of the Angel and the revelation has become so ingrained in the general Muslim mind that the real picture is an anathema to it....The Quran alludes to the fact that the Prophet saw something 'at the furthest end' or 'on the horizon' and this shows that *the experience (of his revelations) contained an important element of the 'expansion' of the self....* But the spiritual experiences of the Prophet were *later woven*

> *by Tradition, especially when an 'orthodoxy' began to take shape,* into the doctrine of a single, physical, locomotive experience of the 'Ascension' of Muhammad to Heaven and were *developed by the Orthodox* chiefly on the pattern of the Ascension of Jesus and backed by Hadith (which) is *no more than a historical fiction* whose materials come from various sources. (p. 14) . . . . Although the experience (of the Prophet's revelations) is described (in the Quran) as a spiritual one, ... orthodoxy, through the Hadith or the 'Tradition' from the Prophet, partly *suitably interpreted* and *partly coined,* and through the science of Theology based largely on the Hadith, *made* the revelation of the Prophet entirely through the ear and external to him and regarded the angel or the spirit 'that comes to the heart' an entirely external agent. (pp. 31-32).

The learned author again appears to sanction and even encourage "Higher Criticism" to be undertaken in regard to Holy Quran when he asserts:

> The question of the 'historicity' of these details, i.e. of the extent of their conformity to earlier pre-Islamic stories and legends is in itself interesting but is beset with difficulties. Nor is the question of the 'material sources' of the Quranic prophetology very meaningful for assessing the real originality and import of the Prophet's message which must be located in the purpose in which these materials were used and the service into which they were pressed. On the other hand, *the Muslim need not fear and reject the historical approach to these materials.* The Quran certainly says about these stories that they are revealed truth; but surely what is revealed is what they are meant to convey and the import with which they are invested. . . . (p. 16)

In other words, the learned author is insinuating that the factual details of these stories about the Prophets in Holy Quran need not be accepted as Divine revelation!

In the face of the clearest historical evidence to the contrary, the author does not hesitate to attack the most fundamental practices of Islam when he says:

> The *five* daily prayers are not all mentioned in the Quran. ....It was in the post-Prophetic period that the number of prayers was inexorably fixed without any alternative at five and the fact of the fundamental three prayers was *submerged under the rising tide of Hadith which was put into circulation* to support the idea that prayers were five. (p. 36)

Dr. Fazlur Rahman's vehement attack on the authenticity of the Hadith and Sunnah is scarcely more than a paraphrase of the identical arguments of Joseph Schacht as contained in *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (*op. cit*).

> The Prophetic Sunnah, outside the fundamental matters touching the religious and moral life of the Community could not have been very large, let alone being of such titanic inclusiveness of all the details of daily life as medieval law and Hadith literature make out to be the case. The evidence as a whole strongly suggests that the situations where the Prophet was called upon to decide or pronounce authoritatively or where he felt compelled to do so, were *ad hoc* situations. Normally the Muslims carried on the business and social transactions of daily life by settling their minor differences among themselves. (p. 51)....Therefore although the Sunnah as a concept referred to the behaviour of the Prophet, its *content nevertheless was bound to change* and derive largely from the actual *practice* of the early community. But the actual practice of a living community must continuously be subject to modification through additions. In a rapidly expanding society, such as the early Islamic one, new moral issues and legal situations, including the almost entirely new administrative system, constantly arose. These moral issues had to be answered and the legal situations resolved....But the concept of an ideal Sunnah

> was retained. *Whatever new materiai was thought out or assimilated, it was given* as an interpretation of the Quran and the Sunnah. This interpretation....was at first based on free and considered individual opinion which was replaced in the second century (of the Hijra) by the concept of systematic analogy. (p. 56)....Modern Islam yearns for creativity and in the interests of the new progress, certain groups have arisen which, if their utterances are taken at their face value, wish to reject all Hadith and rely on the Quran. But in these groups there is hardly any awareness of the issues at stake....for if the Hadith as a whole is cast away, the basis for the historicity of the Quran is removed with one stroke. But the present unrest is equally genuine and expresses a vital need. This need for new vitality and fresh interpretation neither can be nor ought to be suppressed....A candid and responsible investigation into the development of the Hadith by the Muslims themselves is a desideratum of the first order. (pp. 66-67)

In such fashion the author attempts most unconvincingly to undermine the authority of Islam as a practicable and comprehensive guidance for human life in all its aspects. For if the Hadith and Sunnah are not the accurate and authentic teachings of the Holy Prophet, but merely the fabrications of dogmatic jurists and theologians, what can replace them except mere conjecture and wishful thinking? This fallacious reasoning inevitably leads to the following conclusions:

> These examples (of polygamy and slavery) therefore make it abundantly clear that whereas the *spirit* of the Quranic legislation exhibits an obvious direction towards the progressive embodiment of the fundamental human values of freedom and responsibility in fresh legislation, nevertheless the *actual legislation* of the Quran had partly to accept the

> then existing society as a term of reference. *This clearly means that the actual legislation of the Quran cannot have meant to be literally eternal by the Quran itself*. . . . Very soon, however, the Muslim lawyers and *dogmaticians* began to confuse the issue and the strictly legal injunctions of the Quran were thought to apply to any society, no matter what its conditions and what its inner dynamics. . . . .There is a good deal of evidence to believe that *in the very early period, the Muslims interpreted the Quran pretty freely*. But after a period of juristic development during the late 1st/7th and throughout the 2nd/8th century, the prominent features of which were the rise of the Tradition and the development of technical, analogical reasoning, the lawyers neatly tied themselves and the Community down to the 'text' of the Holy Book until the content of Muslim law and theology became buried under the weight of literalism. (pp. 39-40)

"The primary ground for a Hadith being false would be a wilful lie on the part of the...Companions concerned or of the later transmitters. As for the Companions, such a possibility can be ruled out *a priori*. It requires only some insight into the psychological side of the problem in order to relegate such assumptions into the sphere of pure fancy. The tremendous impression which the personality of the Prophet made on these men and women is an outstanding fact of human history and, moreover, it is extremely well-documented by history. *Is it conceivable that people who were ready to sacrifice themselves and all they possessed at the bidding of the Apostle of God would play tricks with his words?* The Prophet had said, "Whoever intentionally lies about me will take his place in the Fire." (Sahih al Bukhari, Sunan Abi Daoud; Jami at-Tirmidhi, Sunan Ibn Majah, Sunan ad-Darimi,

Musnad Ibn Hanbal). This the Companions knew; they believed implicitly in the words of the Prophet whom they regarded as the Speaker for God and is it probable from the psychological point for view that they disregarded this very definite injunction?...... There is one argument more on which the authenticity of a Hadith could be challenged. It is conceivable that either the Companion who heard it from the lips of the Prophet or another of the later narrators has committed—while being subjectively truthful—a mistake due to a misunderstanding of the Prophet's words or a lapse of memory or some other psychological reason. But the internal, that is, the psychological evidence speaks against any great possibility of such mistakes, at least on the part of the Companions. To the people who lived with the Prophet, *every one of his sayings and actions was of utmost significance*, due not only to the fascination which his personality exerted on them but also to their firm belief that it was God's will that they should regulate their life, even in its minute details, according to the direction and example of the Prophet. Therefore they could not take the question of his sayings offhand but tried to preserve them in their memory even at the cost of great personal discomforts. It is related that the Companions who were immediately associated with the Prophet made among themselves groups of two men each, one of whom was to be alternatively in the vicinity of the Prophet while the other was busy in the pursuit of his livelihood or other matters and whatever they heard or saw of their Master, they communicated to each other, so anxious were they lest some saying or doing

of the Prophet should escape their notice.[1] It is not very probable that with such an attitude they could have been negligent as to the exact wording of a Hadith. And if it was possible for hundreds of Companions to preserve the wording of the whole Quran down to the smallest detail of spelling in their memory, then it was, no doubt, equally possible for them and for those who immediately followed them to keep single sayings of the Prophet in their memory without adding to them or omitting anything from them......Modern critics, both Eastern and Western, have not been able to back their purely temperamental criticism with the results of scientific research. It would be rather difficult to do so as the compilers of the early Hadith collections, and particularly the Imams Bukhari and Muslim, have done whatever was humanly possible to put the authenticity of every Tradition to a very rigorous test—a far more rigorous test than European historians usually apply to any historical document...... Until now no critic has been able to prove in a systematic way that the body of Hadith regarded as authentic according to the test-standard of the foremost traditionalists is inaccurate. The rejection of authentic traditions either as a whole or in parts, is so far a purely temperamental matter and has failed to establish itself as the result of unprejudiced, scientific investigation. But the *motive* for such an oppositional

---

1. For a convincing refutation of modernist doubts on the authenticity of Hadith based on the soundest scholarship, read *Sahifah Hammam Ibn Munabbih of Abu Hurairah* compiled and translated with an introduction to the history of the early compilation of Hadith by Dr. Muhammad Hamidullah, Publications of Centre Cultural Islamique, No. 2, Paris, 1961.

attitude among many Muslims of our time can easily be traced. This motive lies in the impossibility of bringing our present, degenerate ways of living and thinking into line with the true spirit of Islam as reflected in the Sunnah of our Prophet. In order to justify their own shortcomings and the shortcomings of their environment, these pseudo-critics of Hadith try to remove the necessity of following the Sunnah, because if this were done, they would be able to interpret the Quranic teachings just as they like on the lines of superficial "rationalism,"—that is, every one according to his own inclination and turn of mind. And in this way, the exceptional position of Islam as an individual and social code would be shattered to pieces......*It is impossible to live according to the Sunnah of our Prophet and to follow the Western mode of life at one and the same time.* This "Westernisation" is the strongest reason why the Traditions of our Prophet and along with them, the whole structure of the Sunnah have become so unpopular today. The Sunnah is so obviously opposed to the fundamental ideas underlying Western civilization that those who are fascinated by the latter see no way out of the tangle but to describe the Sunnah as an irrelevant, and therefore not compulsory aspect of Islam because it is "based upon unreliable traditions." After that, it becomes easier to twist the teachings of the Quran in such a way that they appear to suit the spirit of Western civilization......" [2]

The Doctor's chapter on the development of the

---

2. *Islam at the Crossroads*, Muhammad Asad, Arafat Publications, Lahore, 1963, pp. 121-130.

Shariah is hardly more than a paraphrase of Joseph Schacht's ideas. It is Schacht's theory that while the early Muslims indulged in considerable free-thinking and independent judgment, Imam Shafei was the first Muslim jurist of note to accept the Prophetic Sunnah as laid down in the Hadith as the most authoritative basis for the Shariah after the Quran, and to give to the Law even more authority, he accepted the *ijma'* or consensus of the Companions of the Prophet as almost an infallible guide:

> The qualifications for *Ijtihad* were made so immaculate and rigorous and were set so high that they were humanly impossible of fulfilment, The pictures of the early religious leaders of the Community during the formative period were accordingly *idealised more and more and fiction mixed with facts.* The power of absolute Ijtihad was completely abolished. The relative Ijtihad (that) was allowed....meant either that one was allowed to reinterpret the law within one's own school of law or....one could carry on an eclectic and comparative study of law of different schools and thus find some limited expansion in details. Some rare, bright and bold spirits, such as Ibn Taimiya, claimed the right of absolute Ijtihad for themselves but their recognition in this matter remained limited during the medieval period. We shall see subsequently how the question has been reopened in modern Islam with vehemence by the modernist thinkers. But throughout the medieval centuries, the Law, definite and defined, *was cast like a shell over the* Community (pp. 78-79).

Now let us briefly examine the question as to whether *Ijtihad* can be performed against the unanimous opinion of the greatest legists of the past. There are two aspects of this subject—theoretical and practical. As far as the theoretical aspect is concerned, there is nothing objectionable in the plea that such an *Ijtihad*

can be performed. Since even the most eminent of our Imams were not infallible, an agreed and unanimous opinion of theirs cannot entirely rule out the possibility of error. But it must be remembered that what is theoretically possible is not necessarily the fact. For example, Allama Iqbal was the greatest poet of our country in our time. It is not at all impossible for somebody to arise who would prove himself to be an even greater poet than Iqbal. But suppose on the premise that a greater poet than Iqbal is possible, Dr. Fazlur Rahman claims to be such, how could anybody accept him at his word when he has created no literary or poetical work to establish his claim, not to mention if he could be praised as better than the greatest literary personalities of our history? Now the point is, that concerning an issue on which the Imams of the status of Abu Hanifa, Malik, Shafei and Ahmad Ibn Hanbal are fully agreed, how can any Muslim give the slightest consideration to the *Fatwas* of this modernist, his Islamic learning and motivations being what they are?[3]

---

3. As samples of Dr. Fazlur Rahman's utter distortion and abuse of "Ijtihad", see his "Fatwa" as reported in *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, September 30, 1967 which declares that the mechanical slaughtering of animals for meat, as customary in Europe and America, is permissible in Islam on the authority of the decision of the Ahmadi Imam of the Shah Jehan Mosque in Woking, England and furthermore arguing that pronouncing the benediction of God over the animal is not necessary and also his letter in the October 27, 1967 issue of *Pakistan Times* in criticism of a Muslim reader condemning mechanical slaughter as unhygienic where he attacks the unanimous practice of the entire Muslim community for fourteen centuries as merely "pseudo-scientific speculation prompted by one's own emotional attitude inculcated by various factors." This is the result of his so-called "Islamic research" which can accomplish nothing but to cause quarrels and disunity among the Muslims, weakening them until they fall an easy prey to foreign imperialisms.

In his remaining analysis of Islamic history down to modern times, Dr. Fazlur Rahman has closely followed H. A. R. Gibb's *Mohammedism*, (Oxford, London, 1949), the only difference being that the former's book adds many more details. In his chapter on the pre-modern reform movements, he argues that by their rejection of medieval authorities and their insistence upon Ijtihad (personal original thought), they prepared the groundwork for the modernist movement, but "whereas the earlier movements, while removing authority, offered little new materials to be integrated into the Islamic legacy and sought merely to go back to the pristine Islam, leaving the field where Ijtihad should actually work necessarily empty, this void was filled by the modernists with the intellectual products of Western civilization" (p. 215). He is even so bold as to suggest that the "moral positivism" and shift in emphasis to social welfare rather than other-worldly spirituality of movements like the *Sanussi* provided the intellectual and emotional justification upon which the secular influences of modern education and life later supervened (p. 209). His argument that these movements were the forerunners of modernism is utterly fallacious. Their aim was not to sacrifice the concept of Hereafter to the dictates of worldly expediency but for the *actual implementation* of a pure and unadulterated Islam as a complete way of life while the modernists make no secret of the fact that the thorough-going Westernization of Muslim society is what they want!

Dr. Fazlur Rahman appears to hold the opinion

that our system of education, as it developed historically, was to a very great extent responsible for the stagnation, weakness and decadence of the Muslims:

> The fundamental weakness of medieval Muslim learning, as of all pre-modern learning, was its concept of knowledge. In opposition to the modern attitude which regards knowledge as something essentially *to be searched* and *discovered*, by the mind to which it assigns an *active* role in knowledge, the medieval attitude was that knowledge was something to be *acquired*. This attitude of mind was rather passive and receptive than creative and positive. In the Muslim world, this contrast became still more acute because of the opposition between "transmitted" or traditional on the one hand and the rational on the other. In this controversy, orthodoxy, anxious to safeguard tradition, came out on the whole heavily against reason which it wanted to keep in strict subordination to dogma (p. 191).

The learned doctor may be interested to know how Dr. Samuel Zwemer, one of the most outstanding Christian missionaries who flourished at the beginning of this century, criticised Muslim education on the same grounds when he wrote:

> Right here we stumble upon the supreme fault in their theory of education. The memory is trained to the utmost while the reasoning powers are left entirely undeveloped. A Moslem lad is not supposed to know what the words and sentences mean which he must recite every day; to ask a question regarding the *thought* of the Koran would only result in a rebuke or something more painful. Even grammar, logic, history and theology are taught by rote in the higher Mohammedan schools. Since orthodoxy cannot allow a place for private judgment in the professor's chair, there remains no reason why pupils should think for themselves....The alpha and omega of knowledge are the one

> hundred and fourteen chapters of Allah's revelation. What need is there for other textbooks?
>
> —*Childhood in the Moslem World*, Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer: Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1915, pp. 137-138.

The issue at stake is not the extent to which this criticism, in regard to the traditional madrasah-type education, which stressed memorization at the expense of understanding and has failed to impart a knowledge of Islam in relation to modern needs, is valid. Much more significant is the question as to whether the modern Western education, which Dr. Fazlur Rahman and his sympathizers are so anxious to substitute for our indigenous system, can produce any better results? Indeed the learned Doctor himself answers this question for us, thereby most eloquently and persuasively refuting his own arguments when he pens at the conclusion of his book:

> ......The madrasahs have almost from the beginning of their organized existence aimed at merely imparting a system of ideas, not at creating newer systems and therefore they have not been interested in inculcating the spirit of inquiry and independent thought....Nor has this requisite spirit been adequately generated so far in our modern scholarship. Our modern university system of education is entirely secular and Islamic studies and research have never formed an integral part of it. The products of our modern system of education therefore have no schooling in Islam. Secondly, **those students from this system of education who have cared to study Islam scientifically, have invariably been pupils of Western Orientalists .... The result is that their Muslim pupils have become Orientalist also.**[4] The fact that they are Orientalists remains simply juxtaposed with and mechani-

---

4. The author of this book is an outstanding example!

cally added to the fact that they are also Muslims. On the whole, the two facts have not acted upon one another and borne fruit (pp. 251-252).... The crux of the matter is that the modernist who is a product of the modern university and *not* a scholar of Islam, cannot interpret his past adequately and is therefore always on the defensive against the aggressive revivalist. The modernist is therefore silent —a target but never an archer. *One cannot name a single modernist work on Islamic political theory in modern terms* (p. 230).... The Westernized classes could not match the maturity of the traditionalists in their own domain of culture and learning for lack of sufficient time.... Westernism—the projection of Western modernity into non-Western societies, did not and could not produce high level....results (even) in the specifically modern fields, for it required a period of acclimatization and growth.... Contemporaneously with the present work....certain fresh but important developments have taken place like the establishment of the Islamic Research Institute in Pakistan for the purpose of reinterpreting Islam and training creative scholars and the reorganization of al-Azhar, especially the creation of a research body (there). It will obviously take time, however, for these developments to bear fruit (p. 252)....But the lack of sufficient time is not the whole story. **The basic trouble with Westernism was its lack of morale and ethic which alone could give it strength.** Only some form of effective Modernism could confer upon it the required morale and ethic and root it in the new soil. This effective Modernism it failed to develop....The strength of fundamentalism was the weakness of Westernism itself (pp. 222-223).

Here the author frankly admits that the modernist movement has failed. Nowhere is the proof of this failure more graphically illustrated than in the case of Turkey which has been ruled for forty-five years by a regime that had made the complete Westernization of

the country its very *raison d'etre*. The Kemalists were not only endowed with an extraordinary leader in Ataturk but supported with all the power of a modern totalitarian state to achieve this end. And yet Dr. Fazlur Rahman admits in this book that it was only through militaristic political power that the secularist programme was carried through. "And that is why although Turkish cities (as opposed to the country at large) have been influenced in this direction through official educational policies, *there has not been any significant intellectual expression of secularism by Turkish intellectuals since the regime of Kemal Ataturk*" (p. 224). **This means that Westernization can be imposed upon the Muslims only by force combined with the ruthless suppression of all opposition by those in power backed by foreign imperialisms. In no Muslim country have the majority of people welcomed Westernization spontaneously.** In view of these facts, how can Dr. Fazlur Rahman expect the modernists to succeed in Pakistan?

All of this he blissfully ignores when he declares:

> The task of rethinking and reformulating Islam at the present juncture is much more acute and radical than has faced the Muslim since the 3rd/9th century and the requisite performance is equivalent to the performance of the first two centuries and a half. In other words, the thinking Muslim has to go right behind the early post-Prophetic formative period itself and *reconstruct it all over again*! (p. 251)

It is all very well for modernists, like the author of this book, to indulge in high-sounding slogans and ceaselessly talk about the necessity for "Ijtihad" and Islamic "research" in "a spirit of creative, original

and independent inquiry," but the point is, *what has been its result* ? Even by his own standards of scholarship, Dr. Fazlur Rahman has failed to accomplish his avowed purpose. His chapter on the Holy Quran is largely the anti-supernaturalism of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan; his discussion about Hadith and the development of the Shariah are virtually identical to Schacht's theories; his analysis of Islamic history down to modern times is taken directly from H. A. R. Gibb; his modernist apologetics are the same as contained in Ameer Ali's *Spirit of Islam* and his projection of Islam into the present and future is no different from Wilfred Cantwell Smith's *Islam in Modern History*.[5] In other words, if a scholar of the calibre of Dr. Fazlur Rahman, who is the Director of the State-sponsored Islamic Research Institute in Rawalpindi and the virtual leader of the modernist movement in Pakistan, is so utterly incapable of producing any work of the slightest originality, creativity or independent thinking, what can be expected of his less intelligent followers?

---

5. Dr. Fazlur Rahman was a student of Wilfred Cantwell Smith at the Islamic Institute of McGill University, Montreal, Canada before he began his present career.

ZIYA GOKALP—THE FORERUNNER OF MUSTAFA KEMAL ATATURK

More than four decades after his death, Ziya Gokalp remains the most influential thinker Turkey has produced in recent times. Born in 1876 and educated in Istanbul, he eventually became Professor of Sociology at the University there, composing most of his essays between 1911 until his death in 1924. Intellectually, Ziya Gokalp was the founder of modern Turkish nationalism. Were it not for him, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk's drastic reforms might never have been implemented.

> Until the nineteenth century, the Turks thought of themselves primarily as Muslims; their loyalty belonged to Islam and not to the Ottoman state.... Even the term "Ottoman" was understood not in a national but in a dynastic sense, like Umayyad, Abbasid, Seljuk and the other great Islamic empires of the past.... The concept of an Ottoman nation and an Ottoman fatherland as foci of national and patriotic loyalty were nineteenth century innovations under European influence. They were of brief duration.... (Under Ottoman rule) the language a man spoke, the territory he inhabited, the race from which he claimed descent, might be of personal, sentimental or social significance but they had no political relevance. So completely had the Turks identified themselves with Islam that the very concept of Turkish nationality was submerged.... They had not even retained to the same degree as the Arabs and the Persians an awareness of their identity as a separate ethnic and cultural group within Islam.... The Turks showed little national consciousness—far less, for example, than the Arabs or Persians. The pre-Islamic Turks were

no savages but people with their own states, religions and literatures. Yet, save for a few fragments, all was forgotten and obliterated in Islam.... There is no Turkish equivalent to Arab memories of the heathen heroes of pagan Arabia, to Persian pride in the bygone glories of the ancient emperors of Iran or even to the vague Egyptian legends woven around the broken but massive monuments of the Pharaohs. Save for a few fragments of folk poetry and of geneological legend, all the pre-Islamic Turkish past was forgotten. Even the very name *Turk* and the entity it connotes are in a sense Islamic.... Its generalized use to cover the whole group and perhaps even the very notion of such a group, dates from Islam and became identified with Islam and the historic Turkish nation and culture. Even the Turkish language in the form in which it has existed in the last millenium, was born in Islam.... (to such an extent) that to this day the term *Turk* is never applied to non-Muslims even though they be of Turkish racial origin and citizens of the Turkish state.... The Ottomans had no racial arrogance or exclusiveness, no insistence on "pure" Turkish descent.... Islam.... was the entry requirement which opened the door both to real power and to social status to Albanian, Greek, and Slav as well as to Kurd and Arab.

The Emergence of Modern Turkey, Bernard Lewis, Oxford University Press, 1961, pp. 2-8.

This fortunate historical development which made the Turks the most zealous Muslims in the world and the standard-bearers of the Islamic cause for centuries was not to be tolerated by the nationalists. In the words of Halide Edib Adivar :

Ziya Gokalp wanted to build a new Turkey which would remove the gulf between the Usmanli Turks and their pagan Turanian ancestors. He believed that the Islam established by the Arabs would never suit our purpose. With the ethnic material he had carefully collected about the cultural and political institutions of the pre-Islamic

period of Turkish history, he wanted to initiate a religious reform compatible to our national temperament.

quoted from *Nationalism and India*, Abul Ala Maudoodi, Maktaba-e-Jama'at-e-Islami, Pathankot, 1939, p. 40.

Ziya Gokalp can claim the distinction as the first articulate crusader in the Muslim world for the Western concept of nationalism.

Now the mission of the Turks is nothing but to uncover the pre-Islamic Turkish past which has remained with the people and to graft Western civilization in its entirety on to it. In order to equal the European powers militarily and in the sciences and industry, our only road to salvation is to adopt Western civilization completely !

Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization, Ziya Gokalp, New York, 1959, p. 276.

Ziya Gokalp rejects the supremacy of the *Ummah* or universal brotherhood of Islam because it conflicts with the Western concept of nationalism.

Among the pre-Islamic Turks, patriotism reached its highest levels. In the future, as in the past, patriotism should be the most important area of morality for the Turks because the nation and its soul is ultimately the only self-existing unit. Loyalty to the nation must take precedence over loyalty to family or religion. Turkism must give highest priority to Nation and Fatherland. We shall create a genuine civilization—a Turkish civilization which will follow the growth of a New Life. To classify the Turks, who are fairer and more handsome than the Aryans, with the Mongolian race has no scientific foundation. The Turkish race has not degenerated-like other races, by alcohol and debauchery. Turkish blood has remained rejuvenated and hardened like steel with the glories of the battlefield. Turkish intelligence is not worn out ; its sentiments are not weakened. The conquest of the future is promised to Turkish resolution. (*Ibid.*, pp. 302, 271 & 60.)

In his attempts to make the adoption of modern Western civilization appealing to the popular mind, Ziya Gokalp advanced the following arguments:

> Western civilization is a continuation of the ancient Mediterranean civilization. The founders of the Mediterranean civilization were Turkish peoples such as the Sumerians, Scythians, the Phoenicians and the Hyksos. There was a Turanian Age in history before the ancient ages for the earliest inhabitants of Western Asia were our forefathers. Thus we are part of Western civilization and have an integral share in it. (*Ibid.*, pp. 266-7).

This remarkable distortion of history supports the wild claims advanced by nationalist historians during the regime of Ataturk that the great peoples of antiquity were either Turks themselves or civilized by the Turks. The Phoenicians and the Hyksos were both Semitic peoples; the Scythians were akin to the Persians while the Sumerians defy ethnic classification. Ziya Gokalp forgot even to mention the Egyptians! Would he consider them Turks too?

Ziya Gokalp claims that the Turks revolutionized the history of Europe by destroying the Roman Empire. Like all the radical Turkish nationalists of his day, he identified the modern Turks with the Huns and, as a result, many Turkish parents actually named their children "*Attila*"! The role played by the Huns in the downfall of Rome, despite their destructiveness, was not significant. The kinship between the Huns and the people of modern Turkey is dubious, to say the least, and were I a Turk, I should scarcely take pride in claiming to be among their descendants!

Ziya Gokalp denied Islam the dignity of deserving the rank of an independent civilization of its own.

When a nation advances to higher stages of its evolution, it finds it necessary to change its civilization too. When the Turks were nomadic tribesmen in Central Asia, they belonged to the civilization of the Far East. When they passed to the stage of the Sultanistic state, they entered into the area of Byzantine civilization. And today in their transition to a secular nation-state, they are determined to accept Western civilization. (*Ibid.*, pp. 270-1).

In the adoption of Western civilization, Ziya Gokalp, in contrast to his contemporaries, does not distinguish between the good and the bad, but insists upon thorough-going imitation in every aspect.

The great mistake of the leaders of the *Tanzimat** was their attempt to create a mental amalgam made up of a mixture of East and West. They failed to see that the two with their diametrically opposed principles could not be reconciled. The dichotomy in our political structure, the dual court system, the two types of schools, the two systems of taxation, two budgets, the two sets of laws, are all products of this mistake..........Any attempt to reconcile East and West means to keep carrying medieval conditions into the modern age and trying to keep them alive. Just as it was impossible to reconcile Janissary methods with a modern military system, just as it was futile to synchronize old-fashioned medicine with modern medicine, so it is hopeless to continue the old and new conceptions of law and the modern and the traditional standards of ethics side by side. Each civilization has its own logic, its own aesthetic standards, its own world-outlook. For this reason, different civilizations cannot mix freely with each other. Again, for the same reason, when a society does not take a certain civilization in its entirety as a system, it fails to take its parts too. Even if it takes some parts, it fails to digest and assimilate them. Our *Tanzimat* reformers, who failed to understand this

*The *Tanzimat* movement was the earliest attempt at the westernization of Turkey during the first half of the 19th century.

> point, were always taking half-measures in whatever they attempted to do. Before they took steps to modernize national production, they wanted to change the habits of consuming, clothing, eating, building and furniture. On the other hand, not even a nucleus of industry by European standards was built because the policy-makers of the *Tanzimat* attempted their reforms without studying conditions and without putting forth definite aims and plans. (*Ibid.*, pp. 270-7).

Ziya Gokalp was among the earliest public figures in Turkey to champion a purely secular state which was later implemented by Mustafa Kemal.

> The aim of Turkism in law is to establish modern law in Turkey. The most fundamental condition for our success in joining the ranks of the modern nations is the complete cleansing of all branches of our legal structure of all traces of theocracy and clericalism. The state that is free of these two characteristics of the medieval state is called the modern state. In the first place, in a modern state, the right to legislate and to administer directly belongs to the people. No office, no tradition and no other right can restrict and limit this right. In the second place, all members of the modern nation, regardless of their religious affiliation, are regarded as equal to each other in every respect. In short, all provisions existing in our laws that are contrary to liberty, equality and justice and all traces of theocracy and clericalism should be completely eliminated. **Turkism is a secular movement and can reconcile itself only with movements of a secular nature.**
> (*Ibid.*, pp. 304-5).

In his attempts to prove that there is no incompatibility between Islam and Western civilization, he argues:

> It is only by means of its civilization that Europe has been able to defeat the Muslim nations and become the Master of the world. Why, then, should we hesitate in

taking over this same civilization which has proved so successful? Does not our Muslim faith make it a duty for us to take over all kinds of science and learning as our Holy Prophet himself said, "Seek knowledge even if it be in China," and "Learning is the lost property of the believer ; he should take it wherever he finds it?"* Japan is accepted as a European power but we are still regarded as an Asiatic nation because of our non-acceptance of European civilization in a true sense. (*Ibid.*, pp. 266-7).

Not content to propagate nationalism, Ziya Gokalp wanted to change Islam itself. No nationalist was more fanatical than he in his insistence upon the "purification" of the Turkish language of all words of Arabic and Persian derivation. As a result of this "purification", Turkish as written and spoken a century ago, is utterly unintelligible to the Turk of today. Consequently, whole libraries of priceless Turkish manuscripts and books written in the old Arabic script, containing invaluable gems for any student of Islam, are now rotting away in forgotten archives in Istanbul and other Turkish cities, because not even the older generations can read and understand them. Thus the language reforms have permanently cut the modern Turk away from his past Islamic heritage which was exactly what Ziya Gokalp and his followers intended.

The land where the call to prayer resounds in Turkish ; where those who pray understand the meaning of their religion ; the land where the Quran is learnt in Turkish ; where every man, big or small, knows full well the command of God—oh son of Turkey, that land is thy Fatherland !

---

*Because of their weak transmission, these Hadith are regarded as of doubtful authenticity by Bukhari and Muslim. Even if they are sound, Ziya Gokalp has misinterpreted them and torn them from their proper context.

The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam, Muhammad Iqbal, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, Lahore, p. 160.

Ziya Gokalp fancied himself a great poet. Here is a portion of his poem called "Religion and Science" in which he presents his concept of ideal womanhood:

There is the woman—my mother, my sister or my daughter.

It is she who calls up the most sacred emotions from the depths of my life.

There is my Beloved—my sun, my moon and my star !

It is she who makes me understand the poetry of life !

How could the Holy Law of God regard these beautiful creatures as despicable?

Surely there is an error in the interpretation of Quran by the learned.

The foundation of the nation and the state is the family.

As long as the full worth of the woman is not realized, national life remains incomplete ;

The upbringing of the family must correspond with justice ;

Therefore equality is necessary in three things—in divorce, in separation and in inheritance.

As long as the woman is counted half the man as regards inheritance and in matrimony, neither the family nor the country will be elevated.

For other rights we have opened national courts of justice.

The family, however, we have left in the hands of the jurists and theologians.

I do not know why we have left the woman in the lurch.

Does she not work for the nation?

Or will she turn her needle into a sharp bayonet to tear off her rights from our hands through a revolution? (*Ibid.*, p. 161).

Dr. Muhammad Iqbal in his *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* says:

..."(Ziya Gokalp's) Ijtihad is open to grave objections (pp. 160-1)....With regard to the Turkish poet's demand, I am afraid he does not seem to know much about the family law of Islam..." (p. 169).

Ziya Gokalp's pet project was the reformation of Islam into a modernized and scientific religion. By a "modernized" and "scientific" religion he meant making the mosque as much as possible resemble a Christian church. Four years after his death, his dreams became reality when the new "Faculty of Divinity" at the University of Istanbul appointed a committee to make recommendations through the University to the Ministry of Education. Its report, published in June 1928, recommended among other things, the introduction into the mosque of pews and cloakrooms, that worshippers pray with their shoes on, Turkish as the language of worship and the abolition of Arabic, the elimination of the prostrations in prayer, and in order to make worship in the mosque "beautiful", "inspiring" and "spiritual", "the mosque needs trained musicians and musical instruments. "The need is urgent for modern, Western sacred instrumental music in the mosque."—(*The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, Bernard Lewis, *op. cit.*, p. 408.)

Because the Turkish people are as devout as their Muslim brethren elsewhere, they refused to swallow this mutilation of Islam at the hands of Ziya Gokalp and thus the whole project was soon abandoned as a miserable failure.

MUSTAFA KEMAL ATATURK—AN APPRAISAL OF HIS LIFE AND WORKS

Mustafa Kemal Ataturk was born in 1881 in a shabby quarter of Salonika. After resigning from his job as petty Government clerk, his father, Ali Riza, twice failed in business, sought escape from his miseries in alcohol and died of tuberculosis when he was only seven years old. His mother, Zubaida, in strict *Purdah* and entirely illiterate, ruled the family. In contrast to her husband, she was a devout believer and a pious Muslim. Like every other Turkish woman of her day, her entire life centered round her eldest son. With her deep religious convictions, Zubaida wanted him to become a pious scholar. But the son had different ideas. He fought tooth and nail against any kind of authority and was openly insolent and abusive to his teachers. He was arrogant in the extreme in the presence of his fellow students and refused to join the other boys in their games which made him justifiably unpopular. If he were interfered with in any way, he fought them, preferring to play alone. Once during one of these violent episodes, a teacher, blind with fury, intervened and beat the boy so hard that his honour offended. Mustafa ran away and refused to return to the school. When his devoted mother tried to plead with him, he stormed back at her. Zubaida was in despair, not knowing what to do. Finally an uncle suggested sending him to the military cadet school in Salonika and making a soldier of him.

Since it was subsidized by the government, it would cost them nothing; if the boy demonstrated ability, he would become an officer; if not, he would at least remain a private. In any case, his future livelihood was assured. Although Zubaida did not approve, before she could stop him, twelve-year-old Mustafa persuaded one of his father's friends to sponsor him with the college authorities. He took the examination and passed as a cadet. Here he found himself. He was so successful academically that one of his teachers bestowed upon him the name *Kemal* which means in Arabic, "perfection." Because of his brilliance in mathematics and his military subjects, he was promoted to a teaching position on the staff where he much enjoyed flaunting his authority. After obtaining the highest grades in his final examinations, he graduated with honours in January 1905 with the rank of Captain.

During this period he joined a rabidly nationalistic students society known as the *Vatan* or "Fatherland." The members of the *Vatan* prided themselves on being revolutionaries. They were bitterly hostile to the regime headed by Sultan Abdul Hamid II and condemned him for his suppression of all so-called "liberal" ideas which undermined the authority of Islam. They never wearied of blaming Islam as responsible for Turkey's backwardness and vent their bitter spleen upon the allegedly antiquated Shariah making the Sufi mystics the object of special ridicule. The members of the *Vatan* were bound by oath that they would oust the legitimate Sultan and replace him by a Western-styled government complete with Constitution and parlia-

ment, destroy the authority of the *Ulema* or religious scholars and abolish ***purdah*** and the veil, declaring absolute equality between men and women. Soon Mustafa Kemal became its chief.

Mustafa Kemal's opportunity for extending his influence finally came when, just before the ousting of Sultan Abdul Hamid in 1908 by the Young Turks, its ruling party, *The Committee of Union and Progress* invited him to join them. However, being a late-comer, he was obliged to carry out orders when his nature demanded that either he control everything or take no part at all. He grew increasingly restless and dissatisfied. He had no respect for the other members whom he regarded as beneath his contempt. He particularly hated such sincere Muslims as the Prime Minister, Prince Said Halim Pasha (1865-1921) and the Minister of War, Anwar Pasha (1882-1922), with whom he quarrelled incessantly.

For the next ten years he distinguished himself in the military profession as he was a born soldier and leader. Gradually by dint of his domineering personality combined with shrewdness, he assumed more and more political influence. He spent his evenings in secret meetings behind locked doors planning for the *coup d'etat* which would give him absolute dictatorial power. His opportunity arose when at the end of the First World War, he took the lead in defending the territorial integrity of Turkey against the combined European powers who were intent upon dismembering the "sickman of Europe" and hastening his demise with all deliberate speed. By thwarting these sinister

designs and whipping up the enthusiasm of the populace to fight to the death for their country, Mustafa Kemal Pasha became a national hero. When the Greeks were defeated and Turkey's victory assured, the Turkish people went delirious with joy. They hailed him as their Saviour and bestowed upon him the honorific title *Ghazi* or "Defender of the Faith."

Invitations from diplomats now overwhelmed him urging him to become their champion of the East against the West. To the Arab statesmen he replied in the State Assembly: "I am neither a believer in a federation of all the nations of Islam nor even in a league of all the Turkish peoples under Soviet rule. My only aim is to safeguard the independence of Turkey within its natural frontiers—not to revive the Ottoman or any other Empire. Away with dreams and shadows! They have cost us dear in the past!"

To the Communist delegations seeking his support he expressed himself even more bluntly: "There are no oppressors nor any oppressed. There are only those who allow themselves to be oppressed. The Turks are not among these. The Turks can look after themselves. Let others do the same. We have but one principle—to see all problems through Turkish eyes and guard Turkish national interests."[1]

Mustafa Kemal Pasha's declared policy was to make Turkey within its natural frontiers a small, compact nation and, above all, a prosperous, modern state respected by all the other nations of the world.

1. *The Grey Wolf*, H. G. Armstrong, Capricorn Books, New York, 1961, p. 178.

He was so convinced that he and he alone was qualified to accomplish this task that he claimed: "I am Turkey! To destroy me is to destroy Turkey!"[2]

No sooner had he assumed power than he made bold to declare that he would destroy every vestige of Islam in the life of the Turkish nation. Only when the authority of Islam was utterly eliminated could Turkey "progress" into a respected, modern nation. He made speech after public speech fearlessly and brazenly attacking Islam and all Islam stands for:

"For nearly five hundred years, these rules and theories of an Arab Shaikh and the interpretations of generations of lazy and good-for-nothing priests have decided the civil and criminal law of Turkey. They have decided the form of the Constitution, the details of the lives of each Turk, his food, his hours of rising and sleeping, the shape of his clothes, the routine of the midwife who produced his children, what he learned in his schools, his customs, his thoughts—even his most intimate habits. Islam—this theology of an immoral Arab—is a dead thing. Possibly it might have suited tribes in the desert. It is no good for modern, progressive state. God's revelation! There is no God! These are only the chains by which the priests and bad rulers bound the people down. A ruler who needs religion is a weakling. No weaklings should rule!"[3]

When Abdul Mejjid was elected as Khalifa, Mustafa Kemal Pasha refused to allow the full traditional ceremony to be performed. When the Assembly

2. *The Grey Wolf*, op. cit., p. 227.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 199-200.

met to discuss the matter, Mustafa Kemal cut the debate short: "The Khalifa has no power or position except as a nominal figurehead." When Abdul Mejjid wrote a petition for an increase in his allowance, Mustafa Kemal replied thus: "The Khalifate, your office, is no more than an historical relic. It has no justification for existence. It is a piece of impertinence that you should dare write to any of my secretaries!"[4]

On March 3, 1924, Mustafa Kemal presented a bill to the Assembly to oust the Khalifate permanently and establish the Turkish nation as a purely secular state. However, before this bill was even introduced and made known, he had prudently made certain to muzzle all opposition by declaring it a capital offence to criticize anything he did.

"At all costs, the Republic must be maintained... The Ottoman Empire was a crazy structure based upon broken religious foundations. The Khalifa and the remains of the House of Usman must go. The antiquated religious courts and codes must be replaced by modern scientific civil law. The schools of the priests must give way to secular Government schools. State and religion must be separated. The Republic of Turkey must finally become a secular state."[5]

Consequently, the bill was passed without debate and the former Khalifa and his family exiled to Switzerland. The new regime then enacted the following :

The preamble of the new (Turkish) Constitution speaks

4. *The Grey Wolf*, op. cit., p. 201.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 207-208.

of full dedication to the reforms of Ataturk and Article 153 prohibits any retrogression from these reforms. It said:

'No provision of this Constitution shall be construed or interpreted as rendering unconstitutional the following reform laws which aim at raising Turkish society to the level of contemporary civilization and at safeguarding the secular character of the republic which were in effect on the date this constitution was adopted by popular vote:

1. The law on the unification (and secularization) of education of March 3, 1924.

2. The Hat Law of November 25, 1925.

3. The law on the closing down of dervish convents and mausoleums and the abolition of the office of keepers of tombs and the law on the abolition and prohibition of certain titles of November 30, 1925.

4. The conduct of the act of (civil) marriage of February 17, 1926.

5. The law concerning the adoption of international numerals of May 20, 1928.

6. The law concerning the adoption and application, of (the Latin letters for) the Turkish alphabet (and the banning of the Arabic script) of November 1, 1928.

7. The law on the abolition of titles and appellations such as *Effendi*, *Bey* or *Pasha*, of November 26, 1934.

8. The law concerning the prohibition against the wearing of (indigenous) garments of December 3, 1934....

Complete denial of Ataturkism remains impossible and inconceivable. **It is impossible because the Constitution prohibits it** and inconceivable because old and young have accepted many of the consequences of the reforms and Westernization retains its popular magic as the promise for a richer life.

—*Turkey Today and Tomorrow: An Experiment in Westernization*, Nuri Eren, Praeger, New York, 1963, pp. 100-102.

During the period these reforms were being enforced, Mustafa Kemal Pasha married a beautiful, European-educated lady named Latifa who, during the struggle for Turkey's independence, was encouraged by him to dress like a man and demand for women absolute equality but the moment she grew self-assertive and insisted being treated like a respectable wife instead of trampled upon like a door-mat in his unfaithfulness, he furiously divorced her and sent her away. After his divorce from Latifa, his shamelessness knew no limits. He drank so heavily that he became a drunkard and a confirmed alcoholic. Handsome young boys became objects of his lust and so aggressive was his behaviour toward the wives and daughters of his political supporters that they began sending their womenfolk as far as possible out of his reach. Venereal disease wrecked his health.

In describing his character, H. G. Armstrong, author of *The Grey Wolf*, writes:

> Mustafa Kemal Pasha had always been a lone man, a solitary, playing a lone hand. He had trusted no one. He would not listen to opinions that were contrary to his own. He would insult anyone who dared to disagree with him. He judged all actions by the meanest motives of self-interest. He was insanely jealous. A clever or capable man was a danger to be got rid of. He was bitterly critical of any other man's ability. He took a savage pleasure in tearing up the characters and sneering at the actions even of those who supported him. He rarely said a kind or generous thing and then only with a qualification that was a sneer. He confided in no one. He had no intimates. His friends were the evil little men who drank with him, pandered to his pleasures and fed his vanity. *All the men of value, the men*

who had stood beside him in the black days of the War for Liberation were against him. (pp. 213-214)

And since no Dictator can tolerate any rivals, Mustafa Kemal Pasha lost no opportunity crushing all political opposition.

The secret police did their work. By torture, bastinado, by any means they liked, the police had to get enough evidence to incriminate the opposition leaders who were all arrested. A Tribunal of Independence was nominated to try them. Without bothering about procedure or evidence, the court sentenced them to be hanged.

The death warrants were sent to Mustafa Kemal for his signature in his house at Khan Kaya. Among the death warrants was one for Arif who, after a quarrel with Mustafa Kemal, had joined the opposition. Arif, his one friend, who had stood loyal beside him throughout all the black days of the War for Independence—the only man to whom he had opened his heart and shown himself intimately. One who was there reported that when he came to this warrant, the *Ghazi's* gray mask of a face never changed; he made no remark; he did not hesitate. He was smoking. He laid the cigarette across the edge of the ash-tray, signed the death warrant of Arif as if it had been some ordinary routine paper and passed on to the next....

He would do the thing properly. He would give a ball at Khan Kaya that night also. Every one must come—the Judges, the Cabinet, the Ambassadors, the Foreign Ministers, all the notables, all the beautiful ladies. All Ankara must celebrate....

The dance began quietly. Dressed in immaculate evening dress cut for him by a London tailor, the *Ghazi* stood talking in a corner to a diplomat. The guests moved cautiously watching him. Until he showed his mood, they must step delicately and talk in subdued tones; very dangerous to be merry if he happened to be morose...But the *Ghazi*

was in the best of spirits. This was to be no staid state function. It was to be a night of rollicking fun.

"We must be gay! We must live, be alive!" he shouted as he caught hold of a strange woman and fox-trotted on to the dance floor with her.

The guests one and all followed him. They danced—if they did not, the *Ghazi* made them. The *Ghazi* was at his best, tearing his partners around at a great pace and giving them drinks in between the dances....

Four miles away in Ankara the great square was lit up with the white light of a dozen arc-lamps. Round it and into the streets had collected a vast crowd. Under the arc-lamps below the stone walls of the prison, stood eleven giant triangles of wood. Under each was a man, his hands pinioned behind him and a noose around his neck—the political opponents of Mustafa Kemal about to die.

In the great silence each of the condemned men spoke in turn to the people. One recited a poem, another said a prayer and still another cried out that he was a loyal son of Turkey.........

At Khan Kaya most of the guests had gone. The rooms were stale with the stench of tobacco smoke, of spilt liquor and the foul breaths of the intoxicated. The floors were littered with cigarette butts and the tables strewn with cards and money.

Mustafa Kemal walked across the room and looked out of a window. His face was set and gray; the pale eyes expressionless; he showed no signs of fatigue, his evening clothes as immaculate as ever. The Commissioner of Police had reported that the executions were finished. The bodies below the triangles had ceased to twitch. At last he was supreme. His enemies were banished, broken or dead. .....pp. 229-236.

Meanwhile the rumble of opposition from the Turkish people became a roar. The volcano finally

erupted in 1926 when the Kurdish tribes in the mountains staged an open revolt against the Kemalist regime and all it stood for. Mustafa Kemal lost no time taking action. Ruthlessly all Turkish Kurdistan was laid waste; villages were burned, animals and crops destroyed, women and children raped and murdered. Forty-six of the Kurdish chiefs were sentenced to be publicly hanged. The last to die was Shaikh Said, the leader. He turned to the executioner and said: "I have no hatred for you. You and your master, Mustafa Kemal, are hateful to God! We shall settle our account before God on the Day of Judgment!"

Mustafa Kemal was now absolute Dictator. The Turkish people accepted such anti-Islamic reforms as the banning of the fez and turban, compulsory wearing of Western clothing, the Latin alphabet, the Christian calendar and Sunday as legal holiday only at dagger's point. Thousands of *ulema* and those who sympathized with them sacrificed their lives rather than submit to the destruction of all they held sacred. Nothing can be further from the truth than the delusion that the Turkish people wanted any of this. The intensity of resistance can be imagined from the fact that Ataturk imposed martial law nine times. So despised is this Dictator by millions of Turks, particularly in the villages and small towns, that the mere mention of his name is cursed.

In 1932 Mustafa Kemal decreed that every Turk must adopt a family name as is customary in Europe and America. He chose for himself *Ataturk* which means "The Father of the Turks". Six years later, his

health completely ruined, he died of cirrhosis of the liver caused by alcoholism.

> The category "psychopathic personality" has been called the wastebasket of psychiatry. Into it are dumped all those men who are not psychotic, not psychoneurotic, not feebleminded—yet there is something very much wrong with them.... The psychopath is not psychotic, not "insane." He knows where he is and who he is and what time it is; he dwells in our world, not the fantasy world of psychosis. But the psychopathic syndrone engulfs his whole personality as much as psychosis. The psychopath is not deficient in intelligence. Indeed he may be of above-average intelligence. It is his emotions that are out of kilter, his moral development, his "character." He is cold, remote, unreachable, indifferent to the plight of others, even hostile. He "knows" intellectually the consequences of his criminal acts to himself and to his victims but he is unable to "feel" these consequences emotionally and so he does not refrain from them. He never feels remorse or shame. If he is a murderer captured, he is never sorry that he killed but only that he got caught. He is the hired killer for the mob; for him to kill is nothing. He rejects society. He rejects any obligation to it.... He is in perpetual rebellion. He cannot form permanent emotional ties to anyone. His sex life is random, chancy, for what he wants is sexual satisfaction and the partner matters not.... No reliable statistics exist on the number of psychopaths incarcerated but nobody doubts that among them are the most dangerous humans alive. That is why the prisons are filled with them.
>
> —*Break Down The Walls*: *A Study of the Modern American Prison*, John Bartlow Martin, Ballantine Books, New York, 1953, pp. 259-261.

Word for word, this is an accurate description of the personality and character of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk;

the only difference is that instead of being recognized for what he was, as absolute Dictator, nothing could inhibit him from committing his crimes on a national scale.

None welcomed the dictatorship of Kemal Ataturk more than the intellectuals and politicians in America. The Jews among them accorded him the most enthusiastic praise of all. How the traditions of political freedom and democracy America claims to champion can be reconciled with the atrocities committed under this Dictatorship is an unsolved mystery until the reader understands that the democratic West regards these human rights strictly for home-consumption. Under no circumstances can they be exported to any Muslim land. Official publications from the American Information Service do not hesitate to support such authoritarian regimes so long as they are not openly affiliated with the Communist bloc. Dictatorship, according to this view, is justified if it effectively implements the modernization of the country.[6] The peoples of these "under-developed" places are too backward, tradition-bound, ignorant and illiterate to be allowed to choose their fate. Only the all-wise Government can decide what is best for them. Westernization is the supreme virtue and no sacrifice of moral scruples is too great to attain this end. Therefore any means, including the most ruthless tyranny, is sanctioned with the full blessings of America and the other Western democracies if it accelerates the

6. see *Modernization: the Dynamics of Growth*, edited by Myron Weiner, Voice of America Forum Lectures, Washington, D.C., 1966.

disintegration of the Islamic way of life.

What is the purpose of Kemalism? The answer can be found in a recent book written by a highly-placed diplomat. In describing the daily life of a typical Turkish urban family, as compared with five decades ago before Ataturk, he jubilantly remarks that only the food remains unchanged. After gloating over the "emancipation" of the wife and daughters along Western lines and their discussion round the dining table about their "Sunday outing", an evening at the movies or dinner at a restaurant—"all new features in Turkish family life"—he triumphantly concludes: **"Religion hardly ever crosses their minds except during Ramadan when grandfather or an old aunt fasts."** (*Turkey Today and Tomorrow*, Nuri Eren, op. cit., p. 161.).

What can Muslims inside and outside Turkey do about this before it is too late? The following steps should be implemented at once:

1. Fullest material and moral support must be given to the movement of the saintly Turkish Mujaddid, *Badee-u-Zaman Said Nursi* (1873-1960), which although disavowing active participation in politics, is the only existing organization in Turkey vigorously propagating an unadulterated Islam and capable of resisting the evils of Westernism.

2. The followers of this movement should be encouraged to preach Islam in all the villages and small towns where the people still retain the most fervent devotion to their faith and arouse strong popular agitation demanding that the Government

forthwith repeal all the anti-Islamic clauses in the Constitution together with every un-Islamic law and restore the supremacy of the *Shariah.*

3. Study of Quran and Hadith in Arabic must be made compulsory in every school in Turkey at all educational levels. Secondary school and college students should also be encouraged to study Persian and Urdu and suitable courses made available to them for this purpose. This will strengthen the historical, cultural and religious ties of the rising generation of Turks with their brethren in the Arab world, Iran and Pakistan and promote Muslim unity.

4. The old Ottoman Turkish in Arabic script must be taught as a literary language compulsory for all students in secondary schools, colleges and universities where the finest Turkish classics on Islamic faith and law would be taught as an integral part of their culture. In this way, a most vital part of our heritage would be rescued from oblivion not only for the Turks but also for Muslims in Pakistan and throughout the world.

5. The Turkish language in Arabic script must be restored.

6. Women must be prohibited by law to appear in public wearing indecent, semi-nude attire and all Western fashions and customs, whether male or female, discouraged. The rising generation should be persuaded to dress and behave with the modesty and sobriety enjoined by Islam.

7. The Turkish people should be convinced that

it is against their national interests to identify themselves with the West. They should know that despite Turkey's membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, both America and Great Britain are supporting the Greek regime of Archbishop Makarios and doing nothing whatever to protect the Cypriot Turks from genocide—this is the great "love" the West has for the Turks!

8. The prompt removal of all statues and portraits of Kemal Ataturk from public places, including coins and postage stamps.

When, as a result of the success of these measures, the majority of Turks grow so strong in faith that they would rather die as *Shahids* than submit to the systematic extermination of what they cherish above life itself, even the combined might of America, Great Britain and Freemasonry against Islam will be of no avail and the Kemalist tyranny *inshallah* shall be brought to an end.

SHAIKH MUHAMMAD ABDUH

Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was the leading personality in Egypt during the nineteenth century. His stature must not be belittled because his efforts failed to bear fruit during his life-time. The real impact of Shaikh Muhammad Abduh's influence was felt in the decades following his death. The majority of Egypt's most brilliant statesmen, educators and literary figures were his disciples and associates, either directly or indirectly.

Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was born in 1849 in a small farming village. His parents were devout people of good character although entirely uneducated. He received his early education at the local mosque school. After he had learned to read and write, his father sent him to the local Hafiz to learn the Quran. By the age of twelve he had completely memorized the Quran. The following year his family enrolled him in the mosque school at Tanta but the boy was disgusted with the methods of teaching there. Convinced that he could not benefit from the school, he ran away and returned to his native village, determined never to open another book. When he was sixteen, he married without any ambition beyond tilling the soil like his father.

However, Fate decreed otherwise. An uncle of his father became interested in him and introduced him to Sufism. The boy became so absorbed in Sufism that it grew to be the dominant concern of his life. Invigorated with this new interest, he decided to

go back to Tanta and continue his studies. He became so outstanding that within a short time he received a scholarship to study at al-Azhar.

Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was as disappointed in the education imparted to him at al-Azhar as had been at Tanta. He condemned its methods of teaching as boring, lifeless and dogmatic. He attacked the way books were studied at al-Azhar where more attention was devoted to commentaries and glosses on the commentaries than the original text itself. He held this as responsible for the stifling of intellect and reason. In despair, he gave himself up to Sufism and ascetic practices.

During this time when he had almost lost interest in the world, he met Jamal-ud-Din Afghani, whose dynamic per onality and zeal inspired him to arouse his countrymen out of their apathy and restore the former glory of Islam. But unlike Jamal-ud-Din Afghani, Muhammad Abduh believed that it was preferable to accomplish this through education rather than political revolution.

In 1877 Shaikh Muhammad Abduh graduated from al-Azhar with the title of *Alim* but returned almost immediately as a teacher where he made the revival of Muslim education his main concern. Convinced that modern Western education and science was the key to the wealth and power of Europe, he considered it his duty to exert all his efforts to spreading this new learning throughout Egypt and the adjacent Muslim countries in order that they may become great and strong. As al-Azhar was the intellectual and

educational center of the Muslim world, he became convinced if al-Azhar were reformed, Islam would be reformed. He attacked traditional learning as unsuitable for the modern age and the Shaikhs and Ulema for ignoring the new world and failing to come to terms with it.

Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was an enthusiastic admirer of Europe and its civilization. So stimulating and valuable did he find his travel in England and France that he returned again and again "to renew my soul." He said: "I never once went to Europe when I failed to renew my dream of transforming the lives of my people into something better." He went on to say that whenever he became filled with discouragement in Egypt because of the unyielding opposition he faced, he would go back to Europe "and there within a month or two, these hopes would return to me and the attainment of what I had thought impossible now seemed easy."*

Although Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was opposed to the revolutionary violence of the nationalists led by Ibn Arabi, he nevertheless took their side against the Khedive who openly collaborated with the British. Consequently, after the Arabi rebellion was crushed and the British occupied Egypt, Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was sent into exile. Immediately he went to Paris to assist Jamal-ud-Din Afghani in the writing and publication of *Al Urwah Al Wuthqa*.

Finally in 1883, Khedive Tawfik Pasha pardoned

---

*quoted from *Muhammad Abduh*, Osman Amin, American Council of Learned Societies, Washington, D.C., 1953.

him and not only terminated his exile but also appointed him *Qadi* (judge) in the Courts of the Native Tribunals—a pos the executed with credit and distinction.

However, he never lost sight of his chief task which was to modernize al-Azhar University. Over the years his prestige and influence grew until he was appointed its Rector. In order to win support of the teachers, he increased their salaries, improved their living quarters as well as those of the students, introduced sanitation, free medical attention and renovated the library which was at that time in a sad state of neglect. However, this material renovation was only intended to be a mere preliminary to intellectual modernization. He now began to concentrate his efforts on broadening the curriculum of al-Azhar to include modern, secular subjects in order that it should more nearly resemble a European university. He felt certain that if Islam were modernized and reformed within al-Azhar, its great prestige would spread modern Western ideas throughout the Muslim world. In any case, he was convinced that Al-Azhar could not continue in its present state. Either it must be modernized or fall into decay. However, because its Shaikhs and Ulema felt differently, opposition proved insurmountable. His efforts thus ended in failure although they did provide the basis for the "reforms" attempted after his death.

In despair, Shaikh Muhammad Abduh resigned from the Administrative Committee of al-Azhar. More

and more he began to stake his hopes on the establishment of a completely new university organized from the start on modern Western lines. His dreams became reality three years after his death when Lufti as-Sayyid founded Cairo University (then Egyptian University) in 1908.

On June 3, 1899, with the support of the British, Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was appointed Mufti of Egypt where, as official interpreter of the Shariah, his *Fatwas* (or legal decisions) touching any matters referred to him were regarded as authoritative and final. He continued to hold this position until his death.

His aim was to interpret the Shariah in such a way as to free it from the classical interpretations and prove that Islam and modern Western civilization were compatible. Two of his best known *Fatwas* declared it lawful for Muslims to indulge in picture and statue-making "where there is no danger of idolatry" and the other which allowed Muslims to deposit their money in banks where it would draw interest. He also declared it permissible for Muslims to adopt Western dress.

Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was convinced of the supremacy of human reason. Religion merely supplements and aids reason. Reason sits in judgment on religion. Islam is, above all, the religion of reason and all its doctrines can be logically and rationally demonstrated.

Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was hypnotized by modern science which he tried to read into the Quran.

Here is one example of his reasoning at work:

> The ulema say that the *Djinn* are living bodies which cannot be seen. But it is permissible to assert that the minute living bodies only recently, discovered by means of the microscope and called microbes may well be identified as the *Djinn*.... Consequently we Muslims in regard to the new scientific discoveries, must revise and correct traditional interpretations. The Quran is far too elevated in character to be contrary to modern science.
>
> —quoted from *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*, Charles Adams, Oxford University Press, London, 1933.

Shaikh Muhammad Abduh was convinced not only of the supremacy of the physical sciences but also of the social sciences as interpreted by the leading Western philosophers of his day. He tried to convince his followers that Darwin's theory of evolution could be found in the Quran.

After he was appointed *Qadi* and found it necessary to deal with the new civil laws based on the French code, Shaikh Muhammad Abduh zealously applied himself to learning the French language. When asked why he was so eager to learn European languages, he replied, "because the interests of the Muslims have become inextricably interwoven with those of the Europeans in every country of the world."

Lord Cromer, who was the virtual ruler of Egypt from 1883 to 1907 and one of the chief architects of British imperialism in the Muslim world, had this to say:

> Sheikh Muhammad Abduh was an *Alim* of....a very superior type....Good-natured Khedive Tewfik, *acting*

under British pressure, pardoned him and made him a judge......Muhammad Abduh was in 1899 appointed Grand Mufti....He did his work well and honestly. Sheikh Muhammad Abduh was a man of broad and enlightened views. He admitted the abuses which have sprung up under Oriental governments. *He recognised the necessity of European assistance in the work of reform*....The political importance of Muhammad Abduh's life lies in the fact that he may be said to have been the founder of a school of thought in Egypt very similar to that established in India by Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the creator of Aligarh College....This school is too much tainted with a suspicion of heterodoxy to carry far along with it the staunch, conservative Moslem....Their task is therefore one of great difficulty. But they deserve all the encouragement and support which can be given to them. **They are the natural allies of the European reformer.**

—*Modern Egypt,* op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 179-180.

The consequences of Shaikh Muhammad Abduh's willingness to cooperate with the aims of British imperialism and to compromise Islam with modern life proved nothing short of disastrous. He opened the door wide for all the Westernizers who came after him. Qassim Amin, Ali Abd ar-Raziq, Muhammad Kurd 'Ali and Dr. Taha Hussain carried the liberal trends of his apologetics to their logical conclusions.

Ironically enough, the only one who was not deceived was his closest friend and most devoted disciple, Rashid Rida (1865-1935). Rashid Rida began his career by editing and interpreting Abduh's writings and ideas, but as the years passed, the fallacies of his Master's arguments became more and more

glaringly evident to him. Unlike Shaikh Muhammad Abduh, Rashid Rida had no illusions as to the true nature of modern Western civilization. By the close of his life he had arrived at a crystal-clear conception of Islam and found himself refuting almost everything his Master had taught.

QASSIM AMIN AND THE "EMANCIPATION" OF THE MUSLIM WOMAN

The necessity for the strict segregation of the sexes, the veil, woman's place in the home as faithful wife, her responsibility for the rearing of the children and the management of household affairs, the husband as the head and the provider of the family, his right to divorce his wife in private at his discretion and polygamy —all these practices our Holy Prophet, his Companions, our *Imams*, traditionalists, jurists, theologians and ulema of all schools of thought in Islam for more than thirteen centuries unanimously accepted without question as the basis of Muslim society. Not until European imperialism put an end to the independence of the Muslim world did any Muslim ever feel the slightest inclination to revolt against what had always been universally taken for granted as the position of woman in Islam as laid down by the teachings of the Holy Quran and Sunnah.

The first Muslim in history to wage a campaign against *Purdah* was Qassim Amin (1865-1908)—a Kurd by origin, a judge by profession and a disciple of Shaikh Muhammad Abduh who spent most of his life in Cairo. During the course of his French education, Christian missionary polemics convinced him that *Purdah*, polygamy and divorce were responsible for the weakness and degradation of the Muslims. The more his French education argued for the superiority of modern Western culture, the more crushing grew

his humiliating sense of inferiority regarding his own.

Perfect civilization is based upon science, he wrote, and since Islamic civilization reached its full development before the true sciences were established, it cannot be taken as the model. Like all civilizations of the past, he argued, Islamic civilization had its defects. He insisted it lacked moral originality and denied that the Muslims, even in the Prophet's day, were any better than other men! The path to perfection, he argued, was science and since Europe was the most advanced in the sciences, it was marching on the path to social perfection. "Europe is ahead of us in every way," he wrote, "and although it is comforting to think that while they are materially superior to us, we are morally better but that is not true. The Europeans are morally more advanced and all classes possess the social virtues. The freedom of women in Europe is not based on custom and feeling but on rational and scientific principles. It is useless to hope to adopt the science of Europe without its morals; the two things are indissolubly connected and we must therefore be prepared for change in every aspect of our life."*

These thoughts inspired Qassim Amin in 1901 to write the first book by a Muslim to attack Purdah—*The New Woman*—where he portrayed Muslim home life in the blackest colours: He wrote:

> Man is the absolute master and woman the slave. She is the object of his sensual pleasures, a toy as it were with

---

**Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age,* Albert Hourani, Oxford University Press, London, 1962, pp. 168-169.

> which he plays whenever and however he pleases. Knowledge is his, ignorance hers. The firmament and the light are his; darkness and the dungeon are hers. His is to command and hers is to blindly obey. His is everything that is and she is an insignificant part of that everything.
>
> —quoted from *Childhood in the Moslem World*, Samuel Zwemer, op. cit., p. 158.

Qassim Amin was the first Muslim to prescribe the reform of the Muslim home on Western lines as the panacea for the social problems in the Muslim world.

> Look at the Eastern countries! You will find women enslaved to man and man to the ruler. Man is the oppressor in his home, oppressed as soon as he leaves it. Then look at the European countries! The government is based on freedom and respect for personal rights and the status of women has been raised to a high degree of respect and freedom in thought and action.
>
> —*Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age*, Albert Hourani, op. cit., p. 168.

The real cause of the decay of the Muslims, wrote Qassim Amin, is the vanishing of the social virtues as a result of ignorance. This ignorance begins in the family. To improve the position of women, Qassim Amin advocated a modern Western education which would not only enable them to manage the household but also equip them to earn their own living for until a woman could support herself, he argued, she would always be at the mercy of male tyranny. Modern education would put an end to this "tyranny" and stop the veiling and seclusion of women. Seclusion of women in the home, he argued, is harmful because it is a result of lack of trust. Men do not respect women.

They shut them up in their homes because they do not regard them as entirely human. Man has stripped woman of her human attributes and confined her to one function only which is that he should enjoy her body. The same contempt, he insisted, underlies the practice of polygamy. No woman would willingly share her husband with another and if a man marries a second wife, it could only be by ignoring the wishes and feelings of the first. Divorce he considered as hateful and if it is to be practised at all, women must have the same rights to it as men. There is no reason why women should not enjoy equal political rights with men but he insisted that they needed a long period of education before they could actively participate in public life.

The New Woman is a glaring illustration of the utter enslavement of the modern Muslim to Christian and humanist ideals. Indeed, as one reads this book, it is difficult to believe that its author was a Muslim and not a Christian missionary!

The polemics of *The New Woman* against Muslim society are without any foundation in fact. What Qassim Amin did was to blindly accept all the attacks of the Christian missionaries without ever bothering to investigate the true situation of the Muslim woman with an unbiased and open mind. The truth is that even in this decadent age, the average Muslim home radiates warmth, love and fellow-feeling. Family ties in the Muslim world are stronger than elsewhere. In the traditional family setting, the Muslim woman enjoys dignity,

honour and respect as wife and mother. She observes *Purdah* not because of "male tyranny" but because she knows this is in her own best interest. Of course Muslim women endure heavy affliction but this is much more due to the general poverty and deprivation than any social inferiority of the woman as such.

In his blind worship of modern Western civilization, Qassim Amin could not foresee in 1901 how the feminist campaign in the West, a generation later, would lead to an epidemic of crime, lawlessness and universal indulgence in illicit sex as a result of the complete disintegration of home and family.

> Western civilization has proved to be very cruel to its womanhood. On the one hand it wants woman to bear the burden of nature single-handed and on the other hand, this civilization calls her out to perform the multifarious duties of a man. Thus she has been placed squarely between two grindstones. Moreover, this same propaganda has enticed women in such a way that they are always trying to make themselves more and more attractive to the opposite sex and thus outrage their decency by means of scanty dress or even nudity. They have been turned into playthings in male hands. Islam has proved to be a real benefactor to woman because it has associated each woman to a single man and absolved her from all other men. Islam has placed a high value on those pursuits which are assigned to her by the dictates of nature. Western civilization, on the other hand, has made her the slave of numerous men and has attached a false notion of disgrace to all tasks truly befitting a woman. Islamic teachings regarding the home and family exactly correspond to and befit the real womanly nature.
>
> —(personal letter to me by Maulana Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, April 1, 1961.)

The campaign Qassim Amin waged in his book at the turn of the century against *Purdah* has, with the full support of Christian missionaries and Western imperialism, borne its luxuriant fruit. As a result of his efforts, in every Muslim land, a whole crop of women has sprung up like weeds, determined to destroy the true role of the Muslim woman and reform her until her way of life becomes indistinguishable from her sisters in the modern West.

Dr. TAHA HUSSAIN—THE IDOL OF EGYPT'S INTELLIGENTSIA

For close to a half century, Dr. Taha Hussain has been the idol of Egypt's intelligentsia. Often cited by his admirers as a disciple of Shaikh Muhammad Abduh, it is doubtful if Dr. Taha Hussain ever associated with him personally although his modernist ideas, sanctioned by his enormous prestige, certainly influenced the course of his future life.

Born about 1890 in a small village on the upper Nile, as a young child he contracted ophthalmia, the dread eye-disease. Despite his blindness, Taha Hussain managed to commit to memory the entire Quran which at the age of thirteen won him a scholarship to al-Azhar University. While studying in Cairo, he began to seek the company of Europeanized students and his desire to emulate them resulted in his abandonment of al-Azhar in disgust. The story of this portion of his early life is related in poignant detail in his autobiographical *Stream of Days*, a modern Arabic classic overflowing with sentimentality and self-pity. Among the first to be awarded a Ph.D. at the newly established Cairo University (then Egyptian University), Dr. Taha Hussain was sent on a Government scholarship to Paris to study at the Sorbonne where he earned another Ph.D. and also met his wife, Suzanne Bresseau whom he married in 1918. Upon his return to Egypt, he became Professor of Arabic Literature at Cairo University and later its Dean. It was during this time

that he began to write his controversial books in severest criticism of orthodox Islam.

In 1926 the bomb exploded when his book with the deceptively innocent title *On Pre-Islamic Poetry* was published. The object of this book was to cast doubt on the authenticity of Quran and Hadith and the renowned commentators and jurists of the past by denouncing the pre-Islamic poetry, used as a linguistic method of interpreting the Scriptures, as a wholesale forgery invented "so that the ulema might prove by it what they had set out to prove."

> God has created for human beings minds which find delight in doubting and pleasure in anxiety and perplexity. The necessary consequences of this method are of utmost importance—they amount to nothing less than an intellectual revolution![1]

In the body of this work, Dr. Taha Hussain missed no opportunity to cast ridicule on all the thinkers, jurists and theologians of the formative period of Islamic history for their "blatant trickery" in "forging" the Quran and "manufacturing" Hadith. Not content with this, he insisted that Moses (peace be upon him) had never lived and that the Quranic stories about Abraham and Ishmael belonged in the realm of mythology.

> The Torah may speak to us about Abraham and Ishmael and the Quran may tell us about them too, but the mention of their names in the Torah and the Quran is not sufficient to establish their historical existence, let alone the story which tells us about the emigration of Ishmael, son of Abraham, to Mecca and the origin of the Arabs there:

1. quoted from *Egypt in Search of a Political Community*, Nadav Safran. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1961, p. 154.

> We are compelled to see in this story a kind of fiction to establish the relationship of the Jews and Arabs on the one hand and Islam and Judaism on the other.[2]

Another of his books which exercised a tremendous influence over the minds of his contemporaries was *The Future of Culture in Egypt*. Published in 1938, the purpose of this book was to identify Egypt culturally as part of Europe and outline a programme of public education accordingly. Taha Hussain begins by asking :

> Is Egypt of the East or the West? We may paraphrase the question as follows. Would it be easier for the Egyptian mind to understand a Chinese or a Hindu or to understand an Englishman or a Frenchman? This is the question we must answer before we begin to think of the foundations on which we shall have to base our culture. (p. 3.)

He then goes on to explain that since the beginning of history there have existed two distinct and bitterly antagonistic civilizations—the one in Europe and the other in the Far East. What an over-simplification of history! If there has never been a single civilization existing from "time immemorial" in Europe, how much less is this true of the Far East. The Far East has never been culturally homogeneous. Hindu India and Confucian China differed as much from each other as they did from medieval Europe.

Because of ancient Egypt's sustained relations with Greece and her lack of communication with the Far East, Dr. Taha Hussain argues that "Egypt has always been an integral part of Europe as far as its intellectual and cultural life is concerned in all its forms and

2. *Egypt in Search of a Political Community*, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

branches." The learned Doctor ignores the fact that the only historical period when Egypt was culturally at one with Europe was during the Hellenistic Age inaugurated by Alexander the Great. But there is even less historic continuity between Pharaonic Egypt and Islamic Egypt than between the Athens of Pericles and Byzantium !

Dr. Taha Hussain insists that the adoption of Islam and the Arabic language did not make Egypt any more "Eastern" than Europe when its people embraced Christianity.

> How is it possible for fair-minded people to see no harm coming to the European mind from reading the Gospel and at the same time to regard the Quran as purely Eastern even though it is proclaimed that the Quran was revealed only to confirm and complete what is in the Gospel? They must explain what distinguishes Christianity from Islam for both stem from the same source. The essence of Islam is the same essence of Christianity. The connection of Islam with Greek philosophy is identical to that of Christianity. Whence then comes the difference in the effect of these two faiths on the creation of the mind that mankind inherited from Greece? Why is Europe's connection with Greek culture during the Renaissance regarded as one of the props of the European mind whereas her connection with this same Greek philosophy through Islam is rejected? Can we seriously maintain the existence of any important differences between the peoples living on the northern and southern shores of the Mediterranean? (pp. 7-8.)

Can we indeed? Just imagine this most learned of Egyptians not recognizing any historical difference between Christianity and Islam! What is more probable, however, is that the learned Doctor, in his

zeal to prove Islam no barrier to a thorough-going westernization of his country, did not hesitate to resort to the most unscrupulous distortion of historical facts in order to get his point across.

> We Egyptians measure the progress of our nation solely in terms of the amount of our borrowing from the West. We have learned from Europe how to be civilized. Europeans have taught us to sit at table and eat with fork and knife, sleep in beds instead of on the floor and wear Western clothes. We seek no guidance in our government from the Khalifate. Instead we have set up national, secular courts and enacted laws in conformity to Western rather than Islamic codes. The dominant and undeniable fact of our times is that day by day we are drawing closer to Europe and becoming an integral part of her literally and figuratively. (pp. 11-12.)

Taha Hussain asserts that Westernization would be much more difficult if the Egyptian mind were basically different from the European. In the same breath he chides his countrymen for lagging so far behind Japan in this respect.

> In all seriousness, do we wish to embrace the religion and philosophy of the Chinese just when they are rapidly westernizing themselves? Those Egyptians who deride Western civilization would be the last to want to live like Chinese or Hindus. (p. 22.)

Why does Dr. Taha Hussain assume that his fellow countrymen must choose between these two alternatives? Why should Egyptians want either to be Chinese or Englishmen? Why should they not be proud to live as Muslims? Dr. Taha Hussain purposely omits this question, evidently to belittle Islam in the eyes of his readers as unworthy of an independent and

self-sufficient civilization of its own.

> Khedive Ismail's statement that Egypt is a part of Europe should not be regarded as some kind of boast or exaggeration......If God had preserved us from the Turkish conquest, we should have remained in unbroken touch with Europe and shared in her renaissance. This would certainly have fashioned for Egypt a different kind of civilization from the one in which we are now living......(p. 9) However, God has bestowed upon us a boon to compensate us for our misfortunes and calamities. The world has struggled for hundreds of years to attain its present stage of progress and it is now within our power to reach it within a generation. Woe to us if we do not seize the opportunity! As a matter of fact, the Europeans borrowed the methods that prevailed in the Islamic world during the Middle Ages. They did just what we are doing now. It is only a difference in time. (p. 13)

These days it has become the fashionable trend of our apologetic literature to argue, as does Dr. Taha Hussain here, that because Europe derived her spirit of scientific inquiry from the Arabs, in the process of westernization, Muslims are only reclaiming their rightful heritage.[3] By this sort of sophistry, modern educated Muslims justify the abandonment of their faith. Dr. Taha Hussain conveniently overlooks the historical fact that the transmission of Greek learning from the Muslim world to Europe never made her people part of Islamic civilization. Although medieval Europe eagerly welcomed the achievements of Muslim scientists and philosophers, it never sacrificed its cultural independence as Dr. Taha Hussain urges his

3. Even such a brilliant and sincere philosopher and poet as Allama Muhammad Iqbal, mistakenly advanced the same apologetic in *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1960, p. 7.

country to do.

> No power on earth is capable of preventing us Egyptians from enjoying life exactly the way Europeans do. In order to become equal partners in civilization with the Europeans, we Egyptians must literally and forthrightly imitate Western civilization in all its unpleasant as well as its pleasant aspects. Whoever advises any other course of action is either a deceiver or is himself deceived. (p. 15.)

Shortly before King Farouk was deposed in 1952, Dr. Taha Hussain served as the Minister of Education. During this period he tried his utmost to implement his programme.

> State supervision of the primary and secondary schools of al-Azhar University is vital at this stage of Egyptian history since the traditions and religious obligations of this venerable institution have made it a fortress of conservatism and antiquated practices. Those students who are given an exclusively Azharite education remain isolated from the modern world of which they are a part. Consequently, adjustment after graduation to the complexities of daily modern life is harder for them than other youth. We must also bear in mind that al-Azhar's outmoded thinking probably makes it difficult for its students to grasp the concepts of patriotism and nationalism in the modern European sense of these terms. Some time ago the Rector of the University, in a radio address commemorating a religious holiday, proclaimed the holy *Qibla* in Mecca as the pivot of Islamic nationalism. Young Azharites must learn and be taught early in life that the narrow geographical borders of their native Egypt also form a pivot of nationalism that in no way conflicts with the pivot mentioned by the Rector. Nationalism came to Egypt along with the other products of contemporary civilization and now forms the basis of its internal and external relations. Al-Azhar must realize this and revise its primary and secondary school

> programs accordingly. There is no point in Al-Azhar University waging war against the twentieth century. Al-Azhar should not be deceived by the fact that the masses, whose mentality is still medieval, listen to it today. The rising generations will certainly be cast in the European mold and Al-Azhar will have to evolve along similar lines if it wishes to maintain as close contact with them as with its predecessors. (pp. 27 & 136.)

President Jamal Abdul Nasser took this advice to heart when on July 18, 1961, he decreed that the administration of Al-Azhar University be placed under his direct control. Following Dr. Taha Hussain's program to the letter, President Jamal Abdul Nasser's decree provided for the complete secularization of al-Azhar University by adding to it colleges of medicine, business administration, agriculture and engineering. According to the new plan, the College of Islamic Studies would be isolated and insignificant—no longer an essential prerequisite for graduation. Thus at one stroke, President Nasser, inspired by Dr. Taha Hussain, destroyed one of the world's most important centers of Islamic learning.

Apologists for Dr. Taha Hussain argue that now in his old age, he feels sorry for some of the deeds of his youth and since his recent writings exhibit more sympathy for Islam and its ideals, his past should be pardoned. I do not agree. Dr. Taha Hussain's ideas, as expressed in the books discussed here, are still in active circulation, their harmful influence even stronger today than when written decades ago. If he is sorry for what he did as a younger man, he has never said so publicly, much less attempt to undo the evil.

SHAIKH ALI ABD AR-RAZIQ: THE FIRST *ALIM* TO OPPOSE THE KHALIFATE

Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq was the first Muslim scholar of note to wage a campaign with his pen against the Khalifate and urge the Muslims to adopt secularism and nationalism as their salvation. To be sure, by the time his book, *Islam and the Principles of Government* was published in Cairo in 1925, Ziya Gokalp and Mustafa Kemal Ataturk in Turkey and Lutfi-as-Sayyid and Sa'ad Zaghlul in Egypt had already done their best to eradicate every trace of Islamic influence from the governments of their respective countries, but these avowedly secular leaders at least possessed the boldness to dissociate themselves publicly from Islam and all the ideals it stands for. Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq was unique in that he was an *Ālim* who based his polemics on the assumption that not only should Muslims adopt European political systems, but that "true Islam" has absolutely no connection with the State!

Born in 1888, Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq, like his brother, was a disciple of Shaikh Muhammad Abduh and received his education at al-Azhar University, afterwards journeying to England where he studied for a time at Oxford. In contrast to his brother, Mustafa, who had been to Paris and as Rector of al-Azhar from 1945 to 1947, played an active role in public affairs in his efforts to modernize the university, once the furious

controversy created by his book had cooled, Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq passed the remainder of his life in obscurity.

In 1925 the political fortunes of the Muslim world had sunk to the lowest ebb. Even those exceptional Muslim countries not under direct European rule were no less effectively subjected to indirect foreign political and economic control. After the disastrous defeat suffered by Turkey during World War I, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk had destroyed the Ottoman dynasty and abolished the Khalifate. Consequently, in May 1926 a Congress of the Khalifate was convened in Cairo by a group of Egyptian ulema presided over by the Rector of al-Azhar. Although they unanimously agreed that in theory the Khalifate was an integral and indispensable part of Islam, since under the existing circumstances, it could not command the requisite authority, nothing could be done to implement this institution until at some more favourable time in the indefinite future, perhaps a Khalif might be elected by some Muslim representative body.

Islam and the Principles of Government was the end-product of this bleak atmosphere of pessimism and the acute inferiority-complex of the Muslim intelligentsia as the result of foreign imperialism. Otherwise how could it be conceivable for any Muslim to pose the question whether the Khalifate was necessary or, indeed, if there was even such a thing as an Islamic system of government? Despite the most irrefutable evidence to the contrary, Abd ar-Raziq denied that either the Holy Quran or the Hadith explicitly mentions the necessity

for the Khalifate! He vehemently denied that our Holy Prophet ever sought to exercise political authority, maintaining that his mission was purely spiritual. He wrote:

> The Prophet can have in the political direction of the nation a role similar to that of the ruler but he has a role special to himself and which he shares with no one. It is his function also to touch the souls which inhabit the bodies of men and to rend the veil in order to perceive the hearts within their breasts. He has the right, or rather the duty, to open the hearts of his followers so as to touch the sources of love and hatred, of good and evil, of their innermost thoughts, the hiding places of temptation, the springs of purpose and the foundations of their moral character......... Prophecy, which is all this and still more, implies that the Prophet has the right to unite himself with men's souls by a communion of care and protection and also to dispose of their hearts freely and without obstacle.
>
> —quoted from *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age*, op. cit., pp. 186-187.

"As a Prophet, Muhammad possessed the......spiritual authority having its source in the free, sincere and entire submission of the heart. It was not based, like political power, on the enforced submission of the body. Its purpose was not to regulate the interests of life in the world but to lead men towards God......Forms of government indeed are of no concern to the divine will; God has left the field of civil government and worldly interests for the exercise of human reason. It is not even necessary that the *Ummah* be politically united; this is virtually impossible and even if possible would it be good? God has willed that there should

be a natural differentiation between tribes and peoples —there should be competition 'in order that civilization should be perfected.' Islam recognizes no superiority inside the *Ummah* of one nation, language, country or age over another except for the superiority conferred by virtue. The primitive community (of Islam) was only Arab by accident......The proof that it was no part of his mission to establish an Islamic state is that he made no provision for the permanent government of the community after his death......The first Caliph, Abu Bakr, was invested with what was essentially a political and royal power based on force. His state was an Arab state built on the basis of a religious preaching. No doubt it helped to spread Islam but essentially it was concerned with Arab interests...... Those who rejected the political leadership of Abu Bakr were accused of having abandoned Islam itself. From this time a false idea of the caliphate took root and it was, of course, encouraged by absolute rulers in their own interests......The authority of the caliphate has been harmful to Islam—'a plague for Islam and the Muslims, a source of evils and corruption.'......Islam is innocent of this institution of the caliphate as Muslims commonly understand it. Religion has nothing to do with one form of government rather than another and there is nothing in Islam which forbids Muslims to destroy their old political system and build a new one on the basis of the newest conceptions of the human spirit and the experience of nations......"*

In his analysis of the development of the

* *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age, op. cit.* pp. 185—188.

Khalifate, Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq was not only guilty of outrageous blasphemy; his description is contrary to all historical facts. The Holy Quran would question; "Do they seek to return to the regime of the *Jahiliyyah* (era of paganism) when there is none better than the rule of Allah?" Or in the second Surah where the Holy Quran has appointed the Holy Prophet and his followers as God's vicegerents (*Khulafa*) on earth? The Holy Quran repeatedly refers to the Muslim community as a united body, threatening direst punishment in this world and in the Hereafter against anyone responsible for its dissension and disunity. As an Azharite *Alim*, could he have been ignorant of verse 55 of Surah *an-Nur* where Allah promises the Muslims that Islam will rule the earth and destroy all Godless governments? Or could the learned Shaikh not know of such Hadith which report the Holy Prophet to have said: "If thou wilt break Islam piece by piece, deny it first worldly rule and lastly prayer," or "Islam and government are twin brothers. None of the two can be perfect without the other. Islam is like a great structure and government is its guardian. A building without a foundation crashes down and without a guardian is pilfered and robbed out!" Or could he be so ignorant of Islamic history that he did not know that Abu Bakr accepted the Khalifate with this speech:

> "Now, O people, I am your ruler though I am not the best among you. If I do right, support me. If I commit any wrong, then show me the straight path. Obey me only so long as I obey Allah and His messenger; if I disobey them, then you must disobey me. Know that I am no more than a man from among yourselves."

Are these the words of an ambitious politician who cared only for Arab nationalism or whose authority rested upon royal pomp and the ruthless force of dictatorship as this modernist Shaikh would like us to believe? If our Holy Prophet's mission was purely "spiritual" and he did not seek to implement Islam through any organized political authority, then surely he would have never performed the *Hijra* but instead he would have been content to remain in Mecca, preaching his message against impossible obstacles and fatalistically permitting himself to be slain there by his enemies as a martyr to his cause. This is what the Christian orientalists in Europe and America think he should have done! For centuries Christendom has spread the propaganda that political power cannot be reconciled with a religious mission. That is why Christian scholars almost without exception assert in their writings that our Holy Prophet's character must have been corrupted by his political and military successes after the *Hijra.* So strongly has Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq been influenced by Christian thought that in order to uphold the purity of the Holy Prophet's work, he feels psychologically compelled to argue, against the clearest evidence to the contrary, that he never wanted political power. Neither the Holy Quran, the Sunnah of the Holy Prophet nor the behaviour of the Companions could leave the slightest doubt in the mind of any Muslim or non-Muslim that from its inception, Islam was intended to be an all-embracing movement with a unified community under organized leadership. Important injunctions of Islam such as Zakat, Jihad and even congregational prayers and the

legal prohibitions, which cannot properly be enforced without political power, provide the irrefutable testimony to this fact. Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq and his supporters in the West would have liked Islam to have been mere theology, theoretical philosophy or an idle dream and simply could not accept the fact that it was *actually implemented*. Even less can they tolerate those Muslims today who are still inspired with the examples from their past history and are determined to incorporate them to dominate the Muslim society of the future. According to *Islam and the Principles of Government*, Abu Bakr, the closest and dearest Companion of the Holy Prophet, was thoroughly mistaken in confusing Islam with political power and only its modernist author's futile attempts to transform Islam into Christianity are valid!

THE "ISLAMIC" SECULARISM OF SHAIKH KHALID MUHAMMAD KHALID*

From the day of its publication in 1950, Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid's book, *From Here We Start* created a sensation. After being seized by the ulema of al-Azhar and banned as heretical, a group of Government spokesmen stepped in to defend the book. Consequently, when the ban was lifted, *From Here We Start* immediately became a "best-seller". It was not long before over a half million copies were sold. In view of the fact that when this book came out, three quarters of the Egyptian population were illiterate, this indeed scored a phenomenal commercial success. This enormous popularity is symptomatic of the extent that the literate mentality in Muslim countries had been poisoned by Western ideas. In this book, Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid attempts to outline a programme of social and religious reform, much of which has since been implemented by President Nasser. His claim that the changes he advocates are based upon Islamic principles, made this book especially dangerous for uninformed and immature minds.

The first chapter, entitled *Religion—Not Priesthood*, contrasts the former with the latter. Religion, says Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid, is humane and altruistic whereas priesthood is totalitarian ; religion is progressive while priesthood is reactionary. On the

---

*Khalid Muhámmad Khalid, *From Here We Start*, American Council of Learned Societies, Washington, D.C. 1953.

basis of the English historian, H. G. Wells's book, *An Outline of History*, Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid derives the conclusion that the poverty of modern Egypt is due to the "priesthood" which monopolizes all the wealth of the country, regarding the common people as slaves who should be grateful to grab what few crumbs are thrown out at them. What is most alarming of all, he goes on to say, is that these priests speak in the name of Islam. Not content to starve the body, they also starve the mind, persecute every creative soul, every useful new idea and deny every scientific truth.

> Let us not forget what happened to Christianity. The defeat of the Western priesthood as a worldly power, due to the martyrs who fell in battle for the sake of freedom and progress, should be an instructive lesson for its *living sister, the Egyptian priesthood.* (p. 51).

For his supreme authorities on this question, he relies for inspiration upon such devout Muslims as Thomas Paine, Voltaire and, above all, H. G. Wells who in his *Outline of History* (1929) lost no opportunity to malign and slander our Holy Prophet. But none of this troubles Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid in the slightest. He is hopelessly deluded that Islam and Christianity are identical.

In advising his readers as to what measures should be taken to rid Egypt of the "priesthood", the author reveals pearls of wisdom. Al-Azhar should be modernized and Westernized until indistinguishable from Protestant "divinity" schools. The mosques of Egypt should pattern themselves after the Protestant churches of Europe and America. Mosque preachers

should be trained like Protestant ministers to guarantee their support of the "forces of progress and enlightenment" such as the abandonment of *Purdah* and the propagation of mass government-sponsored campaigns of birth control. Towards the same end, Government decree should restrict Friday prayer to the larger mosques where only carefully selected preachers would be chosen — in other words, mere mouthpieces of the policies of the secular State. Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid is not content to restrict reforms to the mosques. "Have I forgotten the Coptic Church?" he asks. "Oh no! I urge every one of these suggestions to be applied to the Coptic church as well!"

His chapter, *National Rule* is a fervent plea for the adoption of secularism. He attempts throughout to hammer his point home by continuously equating Islamic government under the Khalifate with the Roman Catholic papacy in medieval Europe as if there were no difference between the two! The result is a ludicrous portrayal of the "instincts of religious government" — rule by "divine right," upholding ignorance and superstition in its battle against reason, economic exploitation, absolute despotism which throttles political and intellectual freedom, its "beastly cruelty" which "cuts throats and sheds blood without scruple" on the pretext of "ungodliness and heresy" and, above all, its "stagnancy" and opposition to "enlightenment" and "progress"! "The Khalifates of Abu Bakr and Umar ibn al-Khattab were so unique amidst the hundreds of bloody despotisms that they can safely be regarded as unnatural exceptions."

I suppose the learned Shaikh has never heard of Ali Ibn Abu Talib, Umar Ibn Abdul-Aziz, Salah-ud-din Ayubi or Aurangzeb! Government is an integral part of the Islamic way of life. After the Hijra, Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him) was ruler as well as prophet. He raised armies, declared war, concluded peace, signed treaties, received and sent ambassadors, levied taxes and dispensed justice, thus making Medina a sovereign State by every definition of that term. Yet our learned Shaikh insists that our Holy Prophet did not really wish to rule! Only expediency compelled him to do so! On the same authority of this learned Shaikh, Prophethood is limited exclusively to guidance and preaching! He is apparently blissfully unaware that his arguments why virtue cannot be compelled by law but must depend solely upon mere argument and persuasion are purely Christian ideas, rarely, if ever, practised even by the Christians themselves!

The next chapter entitled *The Deranged Lung* is a passionate polemic for the "emancipation" of women in conformity with modern values.

> When Qasim Amin raised his call for the education and the liberation of Muslim women, the priesthood was quick to react. It filled the air with war cries and shrieks of horror. It mobilized its army of rats to gnaw away with Quranic and Prophetic utterances the details and the general idea of the doctrine that Qasim Amin taught and defended. It applied itself seriously to the task of blowing out the new light. . . . But if ideas are weapons stronger than armies, Qasim Amin was able to fight off his strongest enemies. Accordingly this great reformer triumphed and the doctrine he initiated took root and grew. (p. 53). . . .

> Every morning we see those elated faces make their way through the avenues of Cairo and other Egyptian cities to their schools as if they were a torch procession to a holy temple. That daily procession is itself the most magnanimous tribute paid by this generation of women to Qasim Amin, Muhammad Abduh, and Sa'ad Zaghlul. . . .who created, to their immortal credit, the renaissance of Egyptian women upon a dissolving reactionism. (p. 148)

Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid now proceeds to quote from *The Development of Women's Awakening in Egypt* by Durriyah Shafiq, the founder of the *Bint an-Nil* ("The Daughters of the Nile")—the Egyptian equivalent of our All-Pakistan Women's Association.

> In 1931 a picture was published of Dr. Taha Hussain Bey at the Fuad I University Club surrounded by students of *both sexes* at a tea party. At the instigation of reactionaries, the whole country was shocked by this *innocent* picture, so expressive of the paternal feelings of the Dean for his students. They seized upon the picture as a means to throw overboard such liberals as Dr. Taha Hussain and Lutfi as-Sayyid. (p. 150).

Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid refers to those Muslim ladies still in *Purdah* as "the fettered Eves". In an ecstatic mood, he writes:

> The Eves of the (Muslim) world have come out of the dark dungeons in which they were confined. Even the Eves of the newest states whose religion and traditions are identical with ours have shaken from their shoulders the dust and misery of antiquity. By sending to the United Nations Organization a woman to represent it, Lady Shayset Akram Allah, Pakistan has set a worthy example. . . . . A recent photograph of the women's armed forces of Pakistan in military training has aroused in me a feeling of exalted magnanimity. . . . . (p. 157).

The learned Shaikh appears to parrot the identical ideas Christian missionaries in Muslim lands have been propagating for generations when he asserts:

> We would rather say to the reactionary mobs that the practice by women of their rights will only enhance their eminence and self-respect. The chastity, which you are afraid might be adversely affected, can be prejudiced only through privation and bondage and the feelings you implant in your women that they are merely playthings devoid of any privileges of rights possessed by their masters, the men. Chastity cannot be protected or safeguarded by the walls of a house or dungeon, but by those walls of the spirit and self-respect built in her. Chastity can be assured only through those qualities which the practice of her rights breeds in her. Such practice of her rights makes of woman, as *Emerson* pointed out, a model of legal, social and political virtue. . . . (p. 159).

In other words, the author is trying to say that the virtue and honour of woman depend upon her "rights" to semi-nudism and the unrestricted freedom to mix with men outside the home. These things cannot possibly endanger her chastity! Not the walls of her home, but the walls of chastity of the "spirit"!

Towards the end of his book Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid draws the attention of his readers to Egypt's "population explosion" and like all modernists, the panacea he proposes is family planning. He goes to great lengths, in order to avoid shocking the sentiments of his readers, to "prove" that there is no conflict between Islamic teachings and modern methods of contraception.

> When the Prophet was asked about abstinence, he answered: "It is your duty to abstain."[1] In those days abstinence was the only available means of birth control;[2] the Prophet has allowed it unconditionally. . .[3] If, therefore, Islam tolerates abstinence, which is nothing but the prevention of the fertilization of the prepared ovum by the anxious sperm, it must tolerate, by extension, every modern method of birth control. (p. 112).

Abstinence and birth control are two quite different matters. Abstinence is refraining from the act, while birth control means engaging in the act with the *deliberate intention* of frustrating its purpose! Islam is the religion of nature in the sense that its tenets do not tolerate any artificial distortion of the basic natural laws. The purpose of sex is to provide for future progeny. This law is no less true of human beings than all other living creatures. When for the intention of reproduction combined with marital fidelity, sex is not only natural and necessary but a positive good. The pleasures and enjoyments are no sin when they are recognized as *by-products* to facilitate this end. The pleasures and enjoyments of sex only become an evil when they are *regarded as ends in themselves*. Modern contraceptives are bad from the Islamic point of view because they encourage this corruption on a massive scale.

> It is true that some great and progressive nations encourage the production of children and institute motherhood prizes for that purpose. Such nations are prepared

1. The meaning of the Hadith here is that one must abstain from *illicit* sex—not marital relations.

2. This is not true as the Hadith frequently mention coitus-interuptus as a commonly known method of contraception.

3. False. Birth control is condemned by Hadith.

> for the newborn and are perfectly capable of providing for them all the opportunities and goods of life the moment they arrive. Until we (Egyptians) put our resources into use and achieve such progress and preparedness, *we must remain barren and institute prizes for barrenness*! (p. 114).

What a perfect solution! No Egyptians, no economic problems!

In the chapter entitled *Peace is Bread*, the author advocates "Socialism" as the panacea not only for the economic but the moral ills as well. If his argument is correct that material poverty is the cause of crime and moral corruption, then Europe and America should be heavens of virtue, an argument he appears to overlook entirely. In a sub-heading labelled *No Spiritualism with Privation*, he writes:

> The times of asceticism and of death through resignation are gone forever. We are now living in the time of life-affirmation.... Religion has not come to transform this glorious, enlightened and happy life into a sombre mausoleum in whose corners and crannies life should be spent and death achieved. Rather it has come to us with glad tidings striking the bells and calling all slumberers to rise to the new day. Religion sings in the ears of man: "Yours are the ornaments of God. Yours are the goods of the earth. Yours are the joys of life." But if asceticism points to a few Hadiths of God's Prophet and takes them as sanctions for its doctrine, let it be said. . . if these sayings are genuine, *they have been intended by the Prophet only as extraordinary directives in certain exceptional situations* but never as general rules of moral conduct. All really enlightened and wise men know that such Hadiths are not to be taken literally: that they were intended as only temporary measures to instil some hope in desperate souls . . . (p. 43).

On the basis of what authority does Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid attempt to secure sanction for this

most extraordinary interpretation of Quran and Sunnah? The following quotation reveals how the author attempts, in clear contradiction of Islamic teachings, to minimize men's moral responsibility for their misdeeds.

> Through proven experiments, science has shown that the morals of a man are not far removed from his person, his constitution and the state of his physique. Nor is moral character something acquired merely through good prayer or friendly advice. . . . All human conduct, whether good or evil, is. . . .simply the outcome of our bodily and mental state. The diseased person, for instance, whose nervous capacity has degenerated on account of under-nourishment and the ignorant man who has had no adequate education may not be expected to conduct themselves morally in life and surely there is no reason to expect to find in them any mature virtues of enlightened spirituality. . . Thus Edward Spencer Cowles writes in his book "*Don't be Afraid*" that every change, however little, in the nervous tissue is necessarily followed by a change in the person's mental state. He furnishes us with the example of a person addicted to such excessive use of alcohol that his resistance was completely destroyed, his personality dissolved and any actuality of virtue, character or spirituality utterly extinct. When all advice and coercion had failed to save him, science came to the rescue. A man destitute of all will-power cannot be cured from without. If it is to be successful at all, the cure must start from within. The debilitated cells, the exhausted nerves, the deranged organs—when these are attended to, the rest will take care of itself. With such an important proclamation, the derelict was conducted into the operating room where Dr. Cowles performed the necessary surgery on the spinal column and reduced the inflow of cerebral liquid to the brain. The whole chemistry of the cerebral regions was thus changed and the patient gradually recovered his bodily health. He then became amenable to advice and soon his mental health, innocence, virtue and

spirituality were redeemed. Numerous operations of this kind are repeated every day. (p. 45).

Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid reveals his true philosophy of life, differing not one iota in essence from Marxist materialism, when he is bold enough to declare:

Spiritual capacity depends upon economic capacity. Unless our people at large are fortunate and live without need or anxiety, we shall have no spirituality or even spirit. . . . (p. 47). Spirituality does not start in vacuo. A satisfied, filled stomach always lies behind it as a necessary condition. . . What is the way to this spiritual rebirth? How can social tranquillity and the noble virtues be realized? In our opinion the road thereto consists in a general economic prosperity or, better still, combined with a sound rejuvenating educational program. Unless our economic situation is greatly improved, our society will neither change its heart nor purify itself from its ills . . . (pp. 47-48).

Along with his sympathizers throughout the world, Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid sings the song of modernism in the following lines:

Religion is in constant interaction with life and science. It fully recognizes that its vitality depends so much upon the continued development of life and science that at no time does thought move on while religion stands still. We have seen how in one year, and sometimes in one day, religion has abandoned one judgment for another, one principle for another, ever achieving newer and higher levels of perfection in accordance with the law of evolution. "Whatever verse We have done away with or forgotten," runs the Holy Quran, "We have replaced by an equal or better one." It behoves us to realize that this continued development was not intended to meet the evolving interest of man but to discipline him to meet the changing life and to teach him once and

> for all that the preservation of one state, system or method is impossible even if such a state or system is that of religion or worship. An example of this was the change of *Qiblah* (the direction Muslims must turn in prayer) by the first Muslims.[4] Prayer itself had undergone a similar change. *Everything* does and should change. Priesthood alone remains unaltered. It neither allows itself any change or advances nor tolerates them for anyone else. The community is today exactly as it was thousands of years ago. . . . . Thus would the priesthood have it and keep it (p. 60). . . . This wrong has driven the recent convention of ambassadors in London to write in their proceedings and release to the world press the following statement: "The peoples of the Middle East are still leading a primitive life and are violently being driven backwards by the forces of reactionism. . . . There are only two states in the Middle East which join in the race for development and progress—Turkey and Israel" (p. 158).

It is not surprising why the enemies of Islam in Europe and America applauded Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid's *From Here We Start* as enthusiastically as they applauded Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq's *Islam and the Principles of Government* a quarter of a century earlier. Journals throughout the Western world eulogized Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid as a "highly gifted publicist", the embodiment of progress and enlightenment. His book was reviewed in American periodicals as if it were a triumph of scholarship. Actually it is nothing more than a rehash of the same plea for secularism advanced by Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq twenty-five years before by an *Alim* of much lesser standing.

Ironically, both Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq and Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid were graduates and

4. The order to change the *Qiblah* from Jerusalem to Mecca was not given by "the first Muslims" but by Divine Revelation in the Holy Quran (II: 142).

teachers at al-Azhar University. If the latter undertook to write this book with sincerity and good intentions because he was too ignorant of Islam to do any better, what a dreadful advertisement to the world of contemporary educational standards in predominantly Muslim lands!

ISLAM AND ARAB NATIONALISM

Arab nationalism first became organized more than a century ago in Lebanon under the direct influence and patronage of American Protestant missionaries. The outstanding pioneers of the movement were two Christian scholars, Nasif Yazeji (1800—1871) and Butrus Bustani (1819—1893) whose motto was : "Patriotism is an article of faith." After reading Arab history through the lenses of Western scholarship, they reached the conclusion that the essence of Arabic civilization is independent from Islam. Ibrahim Yazeji continued in the footsteps of his father, sky-rocketing to fame when he composed a long, inflammatory ode to Arab patriotism, eulogizing the glories of the Arab "race" and inciting rebellion against Turkish rule.

At this point, it is necessary to add a few words clarifying the relationship between the Arabs and the Turks. When the power of the Ottoman Empire was supreme, the Arabs were treated on the basis of equality. Revolt of Muslim against Muslim was unthinkable. Under the *Millat* system, Christian minorities enjoyed religious and cultural autonomy. Unfortunately, the entire picture changed as the Ottoman Empire decayed and Turkish leaders replaced the creed of Islam with the most fanatical aspects of modern Western nationalism. Only after this calamity do we find the Turkish political leaders displaying such an intense contempt for everything Arab.

The Arab nationalist movement received its great-

est impetus at the American University of Beirut. Founded by missionaries in 1866 and originally known as the Syrian Protestant College, its influence was soon felt throughout the Middle East. The American University of Beirut can rightly claim the dubious distinction as one of the most powerful weapons in the arsenal of the enemies of Islam. At compulsory daily chapel services as well as in class, discussion groups, and extra-curricular activities, Muslim students are subject to constant indoctrination against Islamic values in the most clever, subtle manner. So effective is this anti-Islamic propaganda that by the time these students are ready to graduate, few, if any, are practising Muslims. Worst of all, it is these same graduates who have for generations assumed the leadership of the Arab world.

One of the first adjacent countries to be affected by this poison was Egypt where many graduates of the American University of Beirut, both nominal Christians and Muslims, sought refuge from Turkish "despotism". Here they were warmly welcomed by Khedive Ismail, the most zealous of the Westernizers, whose motto was : "Egypt is a part of Europe!"

The earliest crusader for modern nationalism in Egypt was Lutfi as-Sayyid who was known by his disciples as "the teacher of the generation." He urged his countrymen to derive their cultural inspiration from the Pharaohs. "We have no sympathy for pan-Islamism," he said, "because it is religious and we believe that nationalism and expediency are our only guides for political action." A famous colleague of Lutfi as-Sayyid was Sa'ad Zaghlul

under whose sway disappeared the last trace of Islamic influence from Egypt's political life. His motto: "religion for God and country for the people," has remained the creed of Arab nationalists to this day.

The prevalent view that Muslims must support the Arab nationalist movement to fight foreign imperialism is no doubt the most deceptive fallacy in their propaganda tactics. A careful study of recent history in the Arab world reveals that far from opposing foreign imperialism, the nationalists have done everything to encourage it.

The most conspicuous example, among numerous others, is the correspondence between Sharif Hussain of the Hejaz and McMahan in 1915 where the latter promised the former a united Arab state from the Euphrates to the Nile if the Arabs would fight with the British against the Turks. Consequently, Sharif Hussain committed a political blunder of the first magnitude when he ordered the Arabs during World War I to side with British imperialism against their Turkish Muslim brethren. Thus when misfortune lay the Turks low, the Arabs stabbed them in the back, so much so that, to this day, their revolt against the Ottoman Khalifate is celebrated as a national feast in several Arab countries. Both Arabs and Turks have suffered ever since and will continue to suffer so long as the enmity between the two peoples remains. Although the last of the Ottoman Khalifs certainly were no angels, at least the propaganda should be stopped praising those Arabs as champions of Islam who betrayed them just at the critical hour when they were locked in a life-and-death struggle to save the Muslims

they ruled from the grip of British imperialism. It is safe to assert that had the Arabs set aside their grievances, no matter how justified, and united with their Turkish brethren against the greater enemy, we would have witnessed no Sykes-Picot Agreement and no Balfour Declaration! The Arab world would be strong and united. Zionism would be extinct and Palestine ours. Hundreds of thousands of destitute and starving refugees today would not be eking out their miserable lives on foreign dole. Instead they would be living peacefully and happily in their ancestral villages and towns. It is unlikely if the anti-Islamic regime of Kemal Ataturk would ever have been able to assume power. Although a few exceptional Arab leaders, such as Sayyid Rashid Rida (1865-1935), Amir Shakib Arsalan and Alhaj Amin al-Hussaini (1895 -), were far-sighted enough to understand the fallacy of nationalism from the very beginning of the Arab revolt against the Turks, their pleas for Muslim unity were not heeded.

Now Sharif Hussain was indeed a crafty politician. Judging from the previous behaviour of British imperialism, he certainly could not have been so naive as to expect McMahan's promises to be kept. It is unlikely if he were at all surprised when, at the end of World War I, the French and British divided the spoils of the Arab Ottoman Empire between them. For serving the cause of British imperialism, Sharif Hussain was richly rewarded. His son, Amir Faisal, was set on the throne of Iraq while his other son, Abdullah became King of tiny artificially-manufactured "Transjordan." Both enjoyed the magnanimous

"protection" of Great Britain. Their slogan was: "The Arabs were Arabs even before Muhammad and Moses!"

The tragedy of Palestine is not merely a loss to the Arabs but a calamity for the entire Muslim world. The nationalists have gained the most wide-spread sympathy among the Muslims of all origins by setting themselves up as the chief defenders of Arab rights in Palestine. They have written more voluminous material and devoted more elaborate oratory to this than any other subject. Yet what do we find? Amir Faisal amicably negotiating with Chaim Weizmann and other top-ranking Zionists who were determined to make Palestine as Jewish as England is English. In the decades that followed, the Zionists grew more and more powerful, thanks to many other Arabs like him who reaped enormous profits by selling their land to the Jews. In October 1949, Dr. Zurayk, former Syrian Minister to Washington and Rector of the Syrian University in Damascus, published a book about Palestine entitled *The Meaning of Disaster*. He wrote:

> The Jews of Israel are living in the present and look forward to the future while we Arabs still dream of the past. ......There must be a new society involving a real revolution in the Arab way of thinking and acting. This society must be democratic and, above all, progressively-minded. To achieve these goals, the following are necessary:
>
> 1. The complete elimination of Islamic influences from the State:
>
> 2. Emphasis in our educational systems upon the practical and experimental sciences.

3. Open-mindedness towards the spiritual and intellectual, as well as the material, aspects of Western civilization.

The above quotation eloquently expresses the prevailing view of those nationalists who believe that in order to fight the Zionists, it is necessary to become like them.

In order that there be no confusion left in any mind as to the true relationship between modern Arab nationalism and Islam, we shall let the following quotations speak for themselves.

On the subject of the Arabic language, Ahmad Khaki in the May 1947 issue of the *Bulletin of the Egyptian Education Bureau*—"The Teaching of Arabic"—expressed a view which is all too common among the nationalists.

> The divergency between the spoken, colloquial Arabic of Egypt and the classical written language of the Quran is so great that most of our school children speak and think in one way while they read and write in another. Although the two channels of language—the colloquial and the classical—may meet in most vocabularies, the grammatical rules governing the construction of the written tongue necessitates so many inflections and inversions when spoken as to make the classical Arabic of the Quran incomprehensible to an Egyptian ten-year old.
>
> So long as colloquial Arabic is the language spoken in the home and so long as it is a medium by which a majority of the subjects in the school curriculum are taught, it will always be the principal living language. *The classical Arabic of the Quran stands alone as an unwanted luxury. Our young people will not tolerate such a luxury and if it is forced upon them, they will not care whether they acquire mastery over it or not.*

Shafik Ghorbal, Director of the Institute of Higher Arabic Studies of the Arab League in Cairo

writes the following in his essay: "The Ideas and Movements in Islamic History", which appeared in *Islam: The Straight Path* (The Ronald Press, New York, 1958):

> (During the Middle Ages) both Muslims and the Christians......sought to bring as much as possible of the worldly affairs of their communities under the rule of Divine Law and to make effective what their faiths teach about the origin and destiny of human society. It is generally admitted, however, that the realization of this hope has always been imperfect and even undesirable......The realization of this hope of a society founded upon religion has been as much of a failure in Islamic society as in Western Christian society......The real difference between the Islamic and Western societies has been the tendency in the Islamic world to condemn or ignore the secular factors. One of the consequences of this (mistaken) attitude is the absence of terms in the Arabic language for the many human activities and relationships, such as church, secular, lay, ecclesiastical, state, political, social. Such key terms sharply differentiating the religious from the secular do not exist or are rendered as approximately as possible although educated Arabs are all aware of what these words stand for......(pp. 42-43).
>
> Since the beginning of the last century, Islamic society has found itself in a critical stage of its development. The period of a hundred and fifty years, which began with the French invasion of Egypt in 1798, witnessed the merging of our Islamic society into the world-wide modern society of the present era......To become aware of these implications is in my view the greatest single problem of the Islamic society of our day....The influence of the West has been so great that even when the Islamic peoples regained their political independence, they have found that a return to the traditional (Islamic) way of life was not possible, even if it were desirable. **It cannot be over-emphasized that such**

a return is not desirable, even when lip-service is paid to the (outmoded) traditions of the past (p. 78).

In another book, *The Ideas of Arab Nationalism*, Hazem Zaki Nuseibah, Foreign Minister of Jordan, has this to say:

As a nation in the modern, secular sense, the Arabs have to begin from scratch. In fact, they have to decide who an Arab is. When religion was the basis of life, an all-embracing value system prescribed the norms, the standards and the criteria of good behaviour. These criteria were accepted and applied to all times and places. Thus to cite one example, Umayyad rule is almost universally disparaged in the Islamic historical tradition on account of its supposedly secular orientation. Quite apart from the fact that most of these historical works were written during the Abbasid period and could not therefore escape the change of partisanship, there is no denying the fact that the Umayyads outraged the accepted norms of Arab Muslim life because of their secular, if not sacreligious activities.

A modern Arab nationalist......would have to reassess and reinterpret the historical verdict of his forefathers on the record of the Umayyads. In the light of modern nationalist categories, what was once condemned in the Umayyads as villainous secularism must now be lauded as praiseworthy nationalism for the foundation of Umayyad policy was the Arab state principle and Arab fortunes went down with the demise of the Umayyads (pp. 61-62).

The next passage which we shall quote from the sixth chapter of Dr. Zurayk's book, *National Consciousness*, is an eloquent illustration how the nationalists distort Islamic history to suit their own purposes.

Muhammad was not only the Prophet of Islam but also the architect of Arab unity. Some might say that the bond of religion at that time was predominant over the bond of nationalism and that Islam was stronger than Arabism. The

answer is that it could not have been otherwise in the Middle Ages and this is equally true both in the Islamic East and the Christian West......But in spite of this, we find a strong Arab consciousness even in the first phase (of Islamic history) when religious sentiment was still at its boiling point. For the Muslims treated the Christians of Taghlib (an Arab tribe) and other (Christian) Arabs more leniently than the non-Arab Christians and some of the Christian (Arab) tribes participated in the early campaigns on the side of the Muslims. This Arab consciousness became stronger following contacts with the non-Arab races......It intensified further as Arabs (of all faiths) rallied together to repel the attacks of the Persians, Turks and other peoples....If we take into consideration the intellectual environment of the Middle Ages when religious sentiments predominated over every phase of life, we find in these inchoate manifestations, fitting seeds for the Arab's national life. These seeds have been growing until in the present day, the bond of nationalism is supreme over every other....(pp. 128-132).

As a result, we find President Jamal Abdul Nasser wasting thousands of pounds of precious foreign exchange, which Egypt can ill-afford, to rescue from the rising waters of the Aswan Dam, the pagan temple at Abu Simbal together with all its idols. All the while he sings the praises of Rameses II (the Pharaoh who was the bitterest enemy of our Prophet Moses (peace be upon him) as the glory of Arabism! Gigantic statues in Cairo commemorate his honour. If this trend is not stopped, we safely can predict that soon Arabian archeologists will be busy digging in the sands for additional sources of Arab glory. And what do you think they will find? **Hubal, al-Lat, al-Manat** and **al-Uzza!**[10] Yes, the idols will be put

10. goddesses of pagan Arabia condemned by the Holy Quran.

back into the *Kaaba* and the major feature of the *Hadj* henceforth shall be a poetical contest among the nationalists as to who can compose the most eloquent eulogies to Abu Jahl and Abu Lahab![11]

What should Arab Muslims and non-Arab Muslims do to avoid this calamity before it is too late? They must be aroused from their slumber and take the following action:

1. We must give our full moral and material support for the revival of *al Ikhwan al Muslimun* under Dr. Said Ramadan (1926 -)—the best surviving *Ikhwan* leader. *Al Ikhwan al Muslimun* is the one movement in the Arab world which has fearlessly propagated a virile, unadulterated faith and is capable of resisting the anti-Islamic ideologies of nationalism and socialism. Muslim leaders in other countries must exert the strongest pressure upon the regime in Egypt, including the threat to cut off diplomatic and commercial relations with that Government, until the *Ikhwan* are released from imprisonment and all restrictions upon the movement repealed.
2. The rising generation of Arabs must be convinced that the slogan of Arab nationalism is but a conspiracy of the Christian missionaries, Zionism and British Imperialism for the complete disintegration of the Muslim world by alienating the Muslim Arabs further and further away from Islam as their rallying force and thereby gradually

---

11. Paternal uncles of our Holy Prophet and his bitterest enemies who plotted his murder for condemning their tribal idolatry and preaching the message of Islam.

restricting and dividing them into increasingly narrow, artificial territorial loyalties until their entity as a people is completely destroyed. The Arab youth must be told that this is the reason why all efforts under the leadership of the British-manufactured *Arab League* to attain unity on the basis of nationalism have failed.

3. The Arab leaders must be converted from nationalism, socialism and Marxism to adopt Islam as the only valid basis for Arab unification and the polity of the State. All efforts must be made through education and the mass media to restore the historical, cultural and religious ties of the Arabs with their Muslim brethren in Turkey, Iran and Pakistan.
4. Arab youth must be convinced that Palestine is not merely an Arab problem but the concern of all Muslims throughout the world. They should understand why any effort to achieve the liberation of Palestine under the slogan of Arab nationalism must end in failure. *Jihad* against Zionism must be organized without delay and an international army composed of young volunteers from all Muslim countries be created under the unified command of *al Ikhwan al Muslimun.*

Let those Arabs who are still deluded that secular nationalism is the salvation of their people, ponder long over these prophetic words of their brilliant historian, Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406):

> The Arabs are incapable of creating a basis of political unity and stability unless inspired by the Divine Revelation of a Prophet or a follower thereof. This is because

their fierce character, pride, roughness and jealousy of one another, especially in political matters, makes them the most difficult of all peoples to lead since their wishes concord but rarely. Should they, however, adopt the religion of a Prophet or a follower thereof, they have an internal restraint and their pride and jealousy are curbed so that it becomes easy to unite and lead them.....For religion drives out roughness and haughtiness and restrains jealousy and competition. Thus, should there arise amongst them a Prophet who calls upon them to follow the ways of God, eschew evil, cling to virtue and unite their wills in support of righteousness, their union becomes perfect and they achieve victory and domination.

(*Muqaddimah*, Vol. I, p. 273)

"ISLAMIC" NATIONALISM

Our Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) foretold that before the Day of Resurrection, the Muslims would imitate the Jews and Christians in every aspect of life. This prophecy has been fulfilled. One of the most striking examples of Muslim imitation of non-believers is their astonishing readiness to replace the concept of a universal Islamic brotherhood transcending geographical, racial and linguistic barriers for the modern concept of nationalism. As destructive as are the growths of parochial nationalisms to the solidarity of the world-wide Muslim community, in recent years an even more dangerous tendency has developed to transform the faith of Islam itself into another nationalism. New-fangled "Islamic" nationalism places its emphasis on the evil of foreign imperialism, grievances of Muslim minorities against their ill treatment at the hands of non-Muslims and, above all, the necessity for "economic development" and social "progress" along modern Western lines. To listen to these "Muslim" nationalists speak, one would suppose Islam to be only another political, social and economic system concerned exclusively with the immediate material welfare of the Muslims. Never does one word come out of their mouths exhorting fear of God, accountability of one's sins before God on the Day of Judgment or the Life Hereafter. In the very next breath after they complain of persecution of Muslim minorities in non-Muslim

lands or shout themselves hoarse over Palestine or Kashmir, they will condemn the fast of Ramadan as hampering industrial productivity, scorn the sacrifice of animals on the Eid al-Adha as a huge economic loss and severely restrict the numbers of Hadjis on the flimsy pretext of "shortage of foreign exchange." But still they possess the audacity to scream from the rooftops, **"We are Muslims !"** To the "Muslim" nationalist, Islam is not a religion but merely another political slogan.

As Dr. Said Ramadan, the intellectual leader of the banned *Ikhwan al-Muslimun* so aptly stated:

> ("Muslim" nationalism) seeks its emotional base sometimes in the vendetta of the wronged or in the nationalistic jingo and sometimes in the chantings of Islam's political glory. In fact, it might be an agglomeration of all of these......If such a movement succeeds, Islamism would become a new jingo. It would then assume the form of a new nationalism. Until now we have been claiming that we are Egyptians or Syrians or Arabs or non-Arabs. Now we are beginning to say, "We are Muslims......" The success of such a movement is not the success of Islam.. It will be merely the formation of a new bloc founded on a new *asabiyah* or chauvinism which is unknown to Islam. Islam is genuine submission to the will of Allah, the Lord of the Worlds; the submission of every affair of life to the commandments of Allah. Unless this happens, no unity of Muslims can become *al Jamiyah al Islamiya.*
>
> —quoted from "Contemporary Islam and Nationalism —A Case Study of Egypt", Zafar Ishaq Ansari, *The World of Islam*, Vol. VII, No. 1-4, E. J. Brill, Leiden, p. 16.

THE DOGMA OF "PROGRESS"--OUR DEADLIEST ENEMY

The philosophy of "progress" has been almost universally accepted with the unquestioning submission of religious dogma. The advocates of this dogma assume that evolutionary progress is the unalterable Law of history whereby the constant advance of the human race by means of its collective material achievements is regarded not only as praiseworthy but inevitable.

As Ellis Rivkin, Professor of Jewish History at the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, said: "The development of Judaism underwrites only one generalization: that **no doctrine, however divine its claim, can persist intact in a world of change, development and novelty.**"* Our modernists would wholeheartedly insist that the same is true of Islam as well!

The philosophy of "progress" rests upon the following assumptions: (1) the uncritical acceptance of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution that mankind emerged from very lowly origins; that when life first appeared on earth, it was of the simplest and lowliest which over the ages has evolved into more and more complex and highly developed creatures at the apex of which stands the human race; (2) that Darwin's theory of biology is equally valid when applied to human society which has emerged from the most primitive level (such as the black; Australian aboriginals) to ever more and more complex and highly advanced

*"Modern Trends in Judaism," Ellis Rivkin, *Modern Trends in World Religions*, The Open Court Publishing Company, La Salle, Illinois, 1959, p. 59.

cultures at the apex of which stands modern Western civilization; (3) therefore to defy modern Western culture is tantamount to defying the Law of evolution —to rebel against "Progress"—against the very Law of nature itself. The progress from the low, primitive culture to ever more highly advanced civilization is not only desirable but an immutable Law of nature. Since every change is an improvement along the road to progress, the newest is always the best and any attempt to defend older or previously-established standards means retrogression to a more primitive way of life; (4) modern scientific knowledge has rendered all religions based upon Divine revelation and transcendental values obsolete. A society whose members regulate all aspects of their lives according to a fixed, divinely-revealed Law, equally valid at all times and in all places, inevitably results in cultural stagnation because once the truth is known, it cannot be changed and without change, no "progress" is possible.

The dogma of "progress" is no more than a psychological weapon to demoralize the non-Western peoples, promote the propaganda that only the culture of the modern West has any future and that all attempts to resist it are hopeless. As one of the disciples of this concept of "progress" writes:

> There is an experience which all societies must undergo. This experience is one in which a society, starting from a position of adherence to a theologically-oriented belief-system, first comes under the impact of modern science, technology, economics and methods of organization and so faces the need to reformulate its belief-system to give it a human orientation. In applying the terms "theological"

and "human" to belief-systems, we do not differentiate between systems that do or do not have a place for the deity and religion, but between those in which the ideas, values and norms they encompass are viewed as having their foundation in objective, "given" transcendentally "revealed" truth and those in which these values are viewed as having their foundation in the truth that is ascertained by the human faculties, including, as the case may be, ideas about the deity and religion. Why a transition is made necessary by modern science, technology, economics and methods of organization is apparent. These disciplines testify to man's ability to understand and manipulate his natural and human environment by means of principles which *he* has discovered or learned. The reason why the transition is so difficult is that belief-systems in general, by virtue of the function they fulfil in a community, become part of the community's consciousness of itself, a means of identifying and distinguishing it from others and they therefore acquire a certain sanctity which makes them more resistant to change than material conditions. To the community, its established belief-system is never the temporary and changing phenomenon that, in fact, it is, but regarded as the culmination and the final result of the historical process. And if this is the case with belief-systems in general, how much more is it with systems, like that of Islam, that are avowedly considered as revealed and sacred?

—*Egypt in Search of a Political Community*, Nadav Safran, Harvard University Press, 1961, pp. 2-3.

Now-a-days nearly all the attacks against Islam and its way of life conform with arguments given in quotation above. Since the dogma of "progress" demands that "change" be worshipped as a virtue in itself, there can be no such thing as permanency in the realm of moral or cultural values. Consequently, any system that claims for itself permanency on a Divinely-

revealed basis, could be appropriate only for the particular time and place of its inception, and therefore must inevitably become obsolete and doomed to oblivion. Hence follows through these spectacles, a characteristic distortion of Islamic history.

> The conception of Muhammad's mission has led to a pessimistic view of history. Until the appearance of the Prophet, it was possible to view the historical process as a progress towards a perfect revelation of God's will but with the appearance of Muhammad, this process came to an end. Since Muhammad was viewed as the "Seal of the Prophets", no further perfection could be expected in the statement and interpretation of the Divine will. Henceforth history could move only on or below the level to which Muhammad had raised it and, as a matter of fact, the chances it would remain on that level were poor. It is clear that in the Islamic view, perfection is to be sought in the past to which all present activity must refer for justification... *Ibid.*, p. 16.

The advocates of "progress" employ all the psychological weapons at their disposal as to make the injunctions of our Shariah appear antiquated and superseded by modernism. Their main argument runs as follows: Since the conditions of contemporary society are so utterly different from what prevailed in the Prophet's day, Islam is thus "out-of-date", the injunctions of our Shariah are irrelevant to modern life and thus provide no guidance, much less solution to today's problems.

> The smashing attack of reliance upon ancient authority (*taqlid*) is an inherent element of the transition from a pre-bourgeois to a bourgeois life. For not only was the authority in question now outdated and irrelevant—it answered questions which in capitalist society do not arise—**but all autho-**

ritative moral codes now in principle are superseded. In an agricultural community, life is, by and large, static; the problems the peasant faces one day are more or less similar to those that he faces another, even to those that his ancestors faced and which, consequently, the wisdom of society has solved. In a peasant village, therefore, morality is a *system* which can be codified and imposed by authority. Furthermore, in such a society, the individual is used to authority in every sphere of life; he is under constant supervision.... With the advent of dynamic capitalism, all this was changed. Innumerable individuals became detached from their traditional bodies their ancestors had belonged to and had to face life on their own account, deprived of the protection as well as the supervision of any authoritative body. Thus, the modern, independent individual came into existence. Not only was the new individual without any authority. The nature of his life in modern society—constantly developing, changing, producing new and more complex situations—was such that **he could never develop a new authority.** The individual himself became morally responsible and had to decide questions on his own.... Thus it is that Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, on rejecting the old Shariah, did not replace it with a new one nor has any of his successors done so but only emphasized the general moral "principles" of the Quran (pp. 12-13).... It is inevitable that sooner or later, the liberals will recognize that the situations in their life are complicated and conditioned by so many *new* and utterly divergent factors that they demand *new* answers. The final stage of this process is when the modern Muslim ceases altogether to regulate and even to think he is regulating his life on ancient patterns. But before this point is reached, there is period in which he devotes himself, not to the specific answers which his Prophet gave to problems but to the "spirit" in which these answers were given.... (p. 70).
—*Modern Islam in India,* Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1963.

Here is a good example how our enemies employ the Marxist concept of cultural values being entirely dependent upon existing material conditions to undermine the whole foundation of Islamic institutions, in this case, the Islamic concept of *Purdah* or the segregation of the sexes:

> "Take this question of the veil. It is not possible that we shall go back to it. Everything depends upon economic life and in Turkey, women are working in banks, as teachers, professors, judges, chemists and lawyers. There are more than twenty women lawyers practising here in Ankara right now. And this applies to the provinces as well. The process has gone much too far for the old ideas to come back. Much has changed. As democracy advances, there will be more change still. The religion of Islam is developing. We earnestly hope that it will continue to develop. But we have no need of a reformer; the life of society will take care of its reformation. . . ."
>
> —*Islam in Modern History*, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Princeton University Press, 1957, p. 203.

Since in this view, the Islamic way of life has been superseded by Western ideals, the best the Muslims can do is to accept the inevitable and reinterpret Islam accordingly:

> If anyone identifies Islam strictly with its medieval version, he must know that he is rendering Islam static and isolating it from the current of time. For medieval Islam—the Islam that our doctors of law and scholars of theology constructed —is not *the* Islam. It is only one interpretation of it. It was an interpretation which suited the conditions of their own space and time. Now under changed circumstances, a new interpretation of Islam cannot help being different.
>
> "Islamic Research—its Scope and Justification," Nasim Ahmad Jawed, *Ummah—The Voice of the Community*, published

by the Central Institute of Islamic Research, Karachi, March 1965, p. 47.

If the fate of Islam lies in the hands of those who profess these views, the inevitable consequences of this mania for "changing with the changing times" will lead to the same predicament as the Christian churches now find themselves in Europe and America.

More than 900 clergymen and students gathered last week at Harvard University Divinity School to ponder over the "new morality" and its significance for the Christian Church. They generally agreed that the "new morality" is a *healthy ad ance* as a genuine effort to take literally St. Paul's teaching that "through Christ we are liberated from the Law." "Lists of can's and cannot's are meaningless," says Princeton's Paul Ramsey. Joseph Fletcher of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge asserted that **no sexual relationship should be absolutely condemned by the church.** The "new morality", he said, would certainly approve of an Episcopal priest in New York City who provides contraceptives for a gang of delinquents he attempts to serve. The core proposition of the "new morality," argued Fletcher, is that there is only one thing which is always good regardless of circumstances and that is neighborly concern, social responsibility which is a Divine imperative. **In the "new morality," the ultimate criterion for right and wrong is not Divine command but the individual's subjective perception of what is good for himself and his neighbor in each given situation.**

—*Time Magazine*, March 5, 1965, pp. 28-29.

Such "progressive" morality cannot but lead to the following consequences:

In the stable world one's environment stayed the same and so did the people who shaped one's life. But in today's world, environments and friends flicker by in endless variety. Whirled along in all this change, individual men and women

change too. Their attitudes and intentions are continuously being reshaped. This year's passionate beliefs may be next year's jokes. Vows sincerely and earnestly spoken may eventually get in the way and have to be trampled underfoot.

—*The Split-Level Trap: A Study of the Modern American Suburb*, Richard E. Gordon, Katherine K. Gordon, and Max Gunther, Dell Publishing Company, New York, 1960, p. 114.

In the view of Professor Wilfred Cantwell Smith, a "progressive" is one in active sympathy with this kind of social change and endeavours to do all he can to promote it while the "reactionary", in order to avoid this "progress", not only opposes it but *reacts against* the changes by seeking to reconstruct a previous social order so that instead of moving forward to a new order, society, shall retrogress back to an earlier stage.* Thus those who want a genuine Islamic way of life in this view would be "reactionaries" to the most intense degree.

The daily *Pedoman* of Jakarta, dated July 15, 1969, reprinted in full a long article written by Professor Pauker in *Orbis Quarterly* (Journal of the Overseas Political Research Institute of Pennsylvania University, winter 1968) regarding the situation in Indonesia. He declared : "The rising tide of Muslim youth, who are increasingly hostile in their attitude towards the fundamental ideals of Western civilization, may in time become the core of a terrorist movement like *al-Ikhwan al-Muslimun* in the Arab world, capable of destroying the weak construction of the existing Indonesian Government." *Indonesia Raya*, also a Jakarta daily,

**Modern Islam in India*, op. cit., pp. 348-349.

dated July 17, 1969, published an interview by its correspondent with Professor Stanley Spector of Washington University. The Professor was in Jakarta leading a delegation of 22 American scholars and conducted a seminar on South-East Asian studies in Bandung. In replying to one of the questions the correspondent asked him, Professor Spector was of the opinion that it is not the Communists who are the real danger but the "conservative and fanatic Muslims." He said : "They are dangerous because they want a static, reactionary order. A modern and progressive reformation of Islam is essential to overcome this threat."*

Now the deception is exposed and there can be no doubt as to what motivates the Western orientalists and Christian missionaries in their frantic attempts to make us "liberal", "modern" and "progressive!" The West has little hatred or fear of Communism because what Marx and Lenin taught is essentially in harmony with the contemporary trends of Western civilization. What the West really fears is the emergence of an Islamic state and a united Muslim bloc. The large number of books on Islamic affairs written in European languages over the last decade and the many departments of Islamic studies, recently established in American universities, testifies that the West regards the Muslim world, even in its decadence, as important enough to require special attention. Of course, the West has nothing to fear from our actual

*"Reply to American Professors," H. S. Shafi-ud-din, ***The Muslim World : A Week y Review of Motamar***, Karachi, August 16, 1969, p. 2.

power which is almost nil but they are deathly afraid of our *potential* power which would not only challenge them politically and economically, but would be uncompromisingly hostile towards the *secular humanism* which has been the foundation-stone of Western civilization ever since ancient Greece. Western civilization has never encountered any serious rival except Islam. That is why their scholars are so much more deeply prejudiced against Islam than other religions or cultures. Professedly anti-Communist America was so delighted when the socialist *coup-d'etat* captured power in the Sudan that she accorded the new regime immediate diplomatic recognition. Since the Sudan happened to be the staunchest Muslim country in the Arabic-speaking world, in order to preclude any possibility of its becoming an Islamic state, the American Central Intelligence Agency lends its support to the Communist conspiracy just because they knew how ruthlessly it would persecute Islam.* Simultaneously, the West floods the Muslim countries with its propaganda that Islamic civilization is an anachronism, that Islamic ideals are "medieval" and hopelessly obsolete. They feel certain that if the rising generation of Muslims can be converted to the dogma of "Progress" so they will consider no alternative but materialistic civilization, they will be too intellectually weak, morally debased and psychologically demoralized to pose any menace to the West.

Let those of us who love Islam and the way of life it stands for not cringe with cowardness when our enemies

*The same holds true for South Yemen which is a thorough-going fanatical Communist state where Islam is relentlessly persecuted.

malign us as "reactionaries." Let us understand why it can do our cause nothing but harm to attempt to please the non-Muslim mind by interpreting the spirit of Islam in conformity with current social and cultural trends. If in seeking our salvation by obedience to the Quran and Sunnah in their plain, literal meaning, modernists accuse us of glorifying the past rather than modern "progress", let us have the courage to reply, "What is so wrong with this?" Let us have the moral courage to condemn modernist values as destructive to society and degrading to the individual personality. Islam is neither past, present nor future but timeless. Good and evil are not mere subjective, relative terms limited to time, place and circumstance, but absolute, eternal and transcendental Truth. Let us, above all, appreciate Islam as an independent way of life with its own unique standards and values which never need be compared with any man-made philosophy for its justification.

THE FUTILITY OF APOLOGETICS— THE CAUSE OF OUR DECAY AND WHAT WE MUST DO ABOUT IT

The struggle between the secular humanism of Western civilization and Islam is nothing new. Nearly one thousand years ago, al-Ghazzali was alerted to the danger which he expressed as follows:

> The heretics of our times have heard the awe-inspiring names of people like Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. They have been deceived by the exaggerations made by the followers of these philosophers—exaggerations to the effect that these ancient masters possessed extraordinary intellectual powers. . . . and that their excellent intelligence justifies their bold attempts to discover the hidden things by deductive methods and that with all the subtlety of their intelligence and the originality of their accomplishments, they repudiated the authority of religious laws, denied the validity of the positive contents of historical religions and believed that all such things are only sanctimonious lies and trivialities. When such stuff was dinned into their ears and struck a responsive chord in their hearts, the heretics in our times thought that it would be an honour to join the company of the great thinkers for which the renunciation of their faith would prepare them. Emulation of the example of the learned held out to them the promise of an elevated status far above the general level of common men. They refused to be content with the religion followed by their ancestors. They flattered themselves with the idea that it would do them honour not to accept even truth uncritically. But **they had actually begun to accept falsehood uncritically. They had failed to see that a change from one kind of intellectual bondage to another is only a self-deception. What position in this world**

of God can be baser than that of one who thinks that it is honourable to renounce the truth which is accepted on authority and then relapses into an acceptance of falsehood which is still a matter of blind faith unaided by independent inquiry?.... (Thus) Aristotle....refuted all his predecessors including his own teacher whom the philosophers call the divine Plato. Having refuted Plato, Aristotle excused himself by saying, "Plato is dear to us, and truth is dear too. Nay, truth is dearer to us than Plato...." We have related this story in order to show that in their own view, there is nothing fixed and constant in the philosopher's position; (in other words, no such thing as absolute truth). They base their judgment on conjecture and speculation unaided by positive inquiry and unconfirmed by faith. They try to infer the truth of their metaphysical theories from the clarity of mathematical and scientific logic. And this method sometimes carries conviction with the weak-minded people. But if their metaphysical theories had been as cogent and definite as their mathematical and scientific knowledge, they would not have differed among themselves on the metaphysical questions any more than they differ on the purely scientific....Such a scandalous attitude is never taken by the unsophisticated masses of men for they have an instinctive aversion to following the example of misguided genius. Surely their simplicity is nearer to salvation than sterile genius....for **total blindness is less dangerous than oblique vision**....

—*Tahafut al-Falasifah of al-Ghazzali*, translated into English by Sabih Ahmad Kamali, Pakistan Philosophical Congress, Lahore, 1958, pp. 2-3.

What al-Ghazzali so effectively refuted is essentially the identical philosophy which threatens the Muslim world today. It is indeed the foundation upon which modern Western civilization rests, namely, that man-

kind can achieve perfection through the intelligent application of human reason, unaided or sanctioned by any supernatural power.

The direct continuity between the Mutazilites of al-Ghazzali's day and the contemporary modernist reformers is most eloquently illustrated in Ameer Ali's *The Spirit of Islam* (London, 1922).

> In Ibn Rushd, Arabian philosophy reached its apogee. Six centuries divide him from the Prophet. Within these centuries the Arab intellect had broadened in every direction. Men like Ibn Sina and Ibn Rushd thought with the accumulated wealth of the ages on all the most important questions which occupy human attention in modern times and formulated their ideas little different from those held by the most advanced scientists (in Europe and America) with logical precision. All these thinkers claimed to be Muslims and were recognised as such by the best minds of their times. Ibn Sina repudiated with indignation and contempt the charge of infidelity levelled against him by fanatics jealous of his fame....(pp. 430-1). Mutazilism spread rapidly among all the thinking and cultured classes in every part of the empire and finding its way into Spain, took possession of the Andalusian colleges and academies. Mansur and his immediate successors encouraged rationalism....Mamun, who deserves more justly than any other Asiatic sovereign the title of "Great", acknowledged his adhesion to the Mutazilite school and he and his brother Mutasim and nephew Wasik endeavoured to infuse the rationalistic spirit into the whole Moslem world. Under them rationalism acquired a predominance such as it has not gained perhaps even in modern times in European countries. The rationalists preached in the mosques and lectured in the colleges; they had the moulding of the character of the nation's youth in their hands. They were the chief counsellors of the Caliphs and....as

professors, physicians, vaziers, or provincial governors, they helped in the growth and development of the Saracenic nation (p. 422). Ibn Rushd considered women to be equal in every respect to men and claimed for them equal capacity in war, in philosophy, in science. He cites the example of the female warriors in (ancient) Greece and (pagan) Arabia and refers to their superiority in music in support of his contention that if women were placed in the same position as men and received the same education, they would become the equals of their husbands and brothers in all the sciences and arts and he ascribes their inferiority to the narrow lives they lead....Ibn Rushd wrote on the concord between religion and philosophy and his latest biographer Ernest E. Renan says: "There is nothing to prevent our supposing that Ibn Rushd was a sincere believer in Islam, especially when we consider how little the supernatural element in the essential dogmas of this religion is and how closely (Islam) approaches the purest Deism...." (p. 431). The fundamental idea of these philosophers was the same as has gained ground in modern times owing to the extension of natural science. But they were not, as their enemies called them, atheists....They were, in fact, the exponents of the doctrine of *Ta'lil* or agnosticism. It appears, therefore, that the Islam of Muhammad contains nothing in itself which bars the progress or the intellectual development of humanity. How is it, then, that since the 12th century of the Christian era, philosophy has almost died out among the followers of Islam and an anti-rationalistic patristicism has taken possession of the bulk of people?....(pp. 434-435)

This is how the author camouflages unbelief as belief. According to this sinister reasoning, Ibn Rushd was far superior as a personality to Umar ibn al-Khattab! The true purpose of Islam, according to him, is not to provide ultimate salvation in the Hereafter for

all mankind through obedience to God's revelation but merely to promote worldly prosperity and brilliance in the arts and sciences. Thus Islam exists for him, not as an independent entity but only as one means among many others to serve the ends of modern Western civilization !

> An important aspect of Muslim apologetics is that Islam first taught what Europe now teaches. "See then how philosophy in the twentieth century comes establishing what the Quran laid down some fourteen centuries ago . . . . democracy whose edifice Muslims pride on their religion's having first set up in the world . . . European scholars have discovered that our forefathers had been working on the evolution theory, the latest of all scientific theories. And so on, all designed to show that the teachings now-a-days most esteemed in the West and by Westerners were long since proclaimed by Muslims. In the endeavour to lift Islam to the standard that the West accepts, it is forgotten that unless Islam not only reaches but *surpasses* such a standard, unless the religion is not only as good but *better* than secular requirements, there is presumably no case against those who abandon Islam and go over to westernism. If Islam originally taught the essence of modernity, then THEY ARE NOT REALLY ABANDONING ISLAM AT ALL. If all Muslim past greatness is a mere forerunner of modern science and philosophy, then it should be accorded appropriate applause and graduallv let die out like any other historical phenomenon.
>
> ISLAM IN MODERN HISTORY, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Princeton University Press, 1957, pp. 144-146.

The above quotation eloquently exposes the fundamental intellectual dishonesty and the utter futility of the apologetic interpretation of our history. *To attempt to justify Islamic Civilization only to the extent to which it is allegedly claimed to be the Forerunner of the*

Modern West is to assert by implication that Islam has already accomplished its mission in history and henceforth has no future as an independent and self-sufficient way of life of its own !

According to Ameer Ali, the ascendancy of Islamic civilization was directly dependent upon the corresponding dominance of Mutazilite philosophy and its defeat was the cause of the decadence of the Muslim world.

> The reactionary character of the influence exercised by Abul Hassan Ali al-Asha'ari and Ahmed al-Ghazzali can hardly be overestimated......But for al-Asha'ari and al-Ghazzali the Arabs might have been a nation of Galileos, Keplers and Newtons. By their denunciation of science and philosophy, by their exhortation that besides theology and law, no other knowledge was worth acquiring, they did more to stop the progress of the Moslem world than any of the other Moslem scholastics and up to this day, their example is held forth as the reason for our ignorance and stagnation.
> THE SPIRIT OF ISLAM, op. cit., p. 487.

This shows the depths of perversity into which the apologist sinks. The fact is that al-Ghazzali himself offered the following statement in defence of the natural sciences :

> A grievous crime indeed against religion has been committed by the man who imagines that Islam defended by the denial of the mathematical sciences seeing that THERE IS NOTHING IN REVEALED TRUTH OPPOSED TO THESE SCIENCES EITHER BY WAY OF AFFIRMATION AND NOTHING IN THESE SCIENCES OPPOSED TO THE TRUTH OF RELIGION. If the learned non-Muslim thinks that Islam is based upon ignorance, he thus grows in love for philosophy and hatred for Islam.

THE FAITH AND PRACTICE OF AL-GHAZZALI, translated by Montgomery Watt, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1954, pp. 34-35.

Exactly as is so fashionable now-a-days, among Western Orientalists, the author eulogizes those who would destroy Islamic values as "enlightened" and "progressive" and maligns those men who dedicated their lives to preserving those values intact as "reactionaries".

> We cannot help contrasting the present condition of the Christian Church which claims to be orthodox in Christendom with that of the one which advocates a similar claim in Islam. From the fourth century ever since its foundation until the revolt of Martin Luther, Catholicism proved itself the mortal enemy of science, philosophy and learning. It consigned to the flames myriads of beings for heresy.
> It trampled out the lispings of freethought in southern France and closed with violence the schools of rational theology....For five centuries (during the same period) Islam assisted in the free intellectual development of humanity, but a reactionary movement then set in....and the cultivators of science and philosophy were pronounced to be beyond the pale of Islam. Is it possible for the *Sunni Church* to take a lesson from the Christian Church? There is nothing in Muhammad's teachings which prevents this. Islamic Protestantism in one of its phases, Mutazilism, has already paved the way. Why should not the great *Sunni Church* shake off the old trammels and rise to a new life? (p. 454)

So enamoured is Ameer Ali of modern Western civilization that in every instance he compares Islamic values unfavourably with it. Failure of Islamic culture to conform in detail to the various phases of the development of European history he assumes as proof

of its deficiency.

The direct continuity between the Mutazilite philosophers of al-Gazzali's day and the contemporary modernist reformers illustrates the consistent pattern which has characterized the whole of Islamic history. On the one hand are those who, while retaining their nominal allegiance to Islam, are intent on adulterating the faith of the Prophet with man-made changes, reforms and improvements. Opposing them are those steadfast *Mujaddids* who have dedicated their lives to preserving and propagating Islam in its undiluted purity. Were the former party to triumph (as it has in all other religions), Islam would be no better than Hindusim, Buddhism, Judaism or Christianity. Our Holy Quran would (God forbid) become as thoroughly and hopelessly corrupted as the present versions of the Bible. Through the mercy and will of Allah, to combat attacks from within and without, *Mujaddids* have arisen in every age to maintain the purity of Islam, some of the most outstanding of whom were Ahmad ibn Hanbal, al-Ghazzali, Ibn Taimiyah and Muhammad ibn Abd al Wahab. In most recent times the renascent Islamic movement has been represented by the *Sanusi* of Arab North Africa, Badee-u-Zaman Said Nursi (1873-1960) of Turkey, *al Ikhwan al-Muslimun* of Sheikh Hassan al Banna (1906-1949) and the *Jama'at-e-Islami* of Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi (1903—), all in mortal ideological combat against all the innovations the Prophet himself condemned. Thus the ideology and purpose of the contemporay modernizers and their Mutazilite predecessors is essentially the same, the only difference being that in comparison to the latter,

the former are intellectual pigmies. One cannot compare in the same breath the intellectual attainment of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Shaikh Muhammad Abduh with such giants in philosophy as al-Kindi, al-Farabi, Ibn Sina or Ibn Rushd whose greatness lies in the fact that they could benefit from Greek learning without inferiority complexes. Greek influence over Islamic civilization was restricted to science and philosophy. All other aspects of Greek civilization abhorrent to Islam and its way of life—its paganism, its emphasis on athletic contests and sports events, its painting and nude sculptures, its music, dramas and literature and its political, economic and social organization—were deliberately rejected. Furthermore, Greek civilization could not possibly exert as harmful effects as contemporary culture because it was defunct and Islam ruled unchallenged over the world—politically, economically, culturally and spiritually.

Most contemporary Islamic literature falls under the category of "apologetics." So long as the political, economic and cultural influence of the Muslim world remained in the ascendancy, the superiority of Islamic values was universally taken for granted. Only after the Muslim world was subjected to European imperialism was any need felt to "apologize" for Islam. Apologetic literature is thus an exclusive product of those Muslims influenced by modern Western education and ideals who, intellectually convinced of the superiority of the latter, strive above all with these criteria to present an attractive interpretation of Islam to the European mind. The following extracts from

Ameer Ali's *The Spirit of Islam* are typical:

> The lives and conduct of a large number of Moslems of the present day are governed less by the precepts and teachings of the Master and more by the theories and opinions of the *Mujaddids* and *Imams* who,....oblivious to the universality of the Master's teachings, unassisted by his spirit and devoid of his inspiration, have adapted his utterances to their own limited notions of human needs and human progress. They mixed up the temporary with the permanent, the universal with the particular....In the Western world, the Reformation was ushered in by the Renaissance and the progress of Europe commenced when it threw off the shackles of Ecclesiasticism. In Islam also, enlightenment must precede reform and before there can be a renovation of religious life, the mind must first escape from the bondage centuries of literal interpretation and the doctrine of conformity have imposed upon it....The formalism that does not appeal to the heart of the worshipper must be abandoned; externals must be subordinated to the inner feelings.....The reformation of Islam will begin once it is recognized that divine words rendered into any language retain their divine character and that devotion offered in any tongue is acceptable to God. The Prophet himself had allowed his foreign disciples to say their prayers in their own tongue*....(pp. 184-86)

To put it bluntly, reason, the "highest and noblest function of the human intellect", should henceforth be consecrated to disproving and undermining the permanency and authority of God's revelation, replace divine, Islamic values with man-made Western innovations, and employ *Ijtihad*, to destroy the universal *Ummah* of Islam by encouraging the growth

---

* False. Our Holy Prophet always insisted that the formal, ritual prayer (*Salat*) must be recited in Arabic. Informal, personal supplications (*du'a*), however, may be said in the native tongue of the worshipper.

of local nationalisms.

In certain stages of social development, polygamy—the union of one man with several women—is unavoidable. The frequent tribal wars and the consequent decimation of the male population, the numerical superiority of women combined with the absolute power possessed by the chiefs, originated the custom which in our advanced time is justly regarded as an unendurable evil.....(p. 222) With the progress of thought, with the ever-changing conditions of the world, the necessity of polygamy disappears.....and hence it is that in those Moslem countries where the circumstances which made its existence necessary are disappearing, plurality of wives has come to be regarded as an evil and as an institution opposed to the teachings of the Prophet....The task of abolishing polygamy is not so difficult as imagined. The blight that has fallen on the Muslim nations is due to the doctrine which has prohibited the exercise of individual judgment (*Ijtihad*). The day is not far distant when an appeal to the Teacher's own words will settle the question whether the Muslims will follow Mohammad or the *Fathers of the Church* who have misused the Master's name to satisfy their own whimsicalities. Europe has gone through the same process herself and instead of hurling anathemas at the *Church of Mohammad*, ought to watch with patience and sympathy, the efforts of regenerated Islam to free itself from bondage. When once the freedom from the enthralment of old ideas is achieved, it will be easy for the jurists of each particular Moslem state to abolish by authoritative dictum polygamy within that state.... Polygamy is disappearing or will soon disappear under the new light in which the Prophet's teachings are being studied....(p. 231). Probably it will be said that no necessity should have induced the Prophet either to practise or allow such an evil custom as polygamy and that he

ought to have forbidden it absolutely....But evil is a relative term. That ideas are progressive is a truism and are good or evil according to circumstances with the "spirit of the time", a fact much ignored by superficial thinkers.... (p. 238)

In concise and blunt language, Ameer Ali means that the Muslim world should condemn polygamy as an unendurable evil simply because the modern West says so. In other words, to him, modern Western criteria for good and evil are superior in authority to the Quran and the Sunnah which are only appropriate for the primitive society of 7th century Arabia and were the Holy Prophet himself living today, he would feel likewise! In the author's eyes, polygamy is worse than adultery and fornication which evidently he does not consider of sufficient importance even to be mentioned!

It cannot be denied that several institutions which the Muslims borrowed from the pre-Islamic period, "The Days of Ignorance", and which exist simply as so many survivals of an older growth, have the tendency to retard the advancement of *Mohammedan* nations. Among them, the system of the seculsion of women is one. It had been practised among most of the nations of antiquity from earliest times....The Prophet of Islam found it existing among the Persians and other Oriental communities; he perceived its advantages and it is possible that in view of the wide-spread laxity of morals among all classes of people (in those days), he recommended to the women-folk the observance of privacy. **But to suppose he ever intended his recommendation should assume its present inelastic form or that he ever allowed or enjoined the seclusion of women is wholly opposed to the spirit of his reforms**.... (pp. 248-49)

In other words, the promiscuous and unrestricted intermingling of the sexes characteristic of modern society with all its ugly and inevitable consequences, is more compatible with the "spirit" of our Holy Prophet's teachings than *Purdah*!

> Slavery in some of its features has been aptly compared with polygamy....Like polygamy, it has existed among all nations and has died away with the progress of human thought and the growth of a sense of justice among mankind (p. 258)....Like polygamy, the institution of slavery....has at least outlived the necessities which induced its practice and must sooner or later become extinct. It will be seen, therefore, that Islam did not consecrate slavery, as has been maliciously affirmed, but provided in every way for its abolition and extinction by circumscribing the means of possession within the narrowest limits. Islam did not deal capriciously with this important question. Whilst proclaiming in the most emphatic form the natural equality of human beings, it did not, regardless of consequences, enfranchise the men and women already in bondage which would only have been productive of evil in a world not then ripe for that consummation of human liberty, moral and intellectual....The time has now arrived when humanity at large should raise its voice against the practice of servitude and the Moslems, especially for the honour of the great Prophet, should try to efface that dark page of their history—a page which would never have been written but for their contravention of the laws....It remains for the Moslems to show the falseness of the aspersions cast on the memory of the great and noble Prophet by proclaiming in explicit terms that slavery is reprobated by their Prophet and discountenanced by their code (p. 267)

Ameer Ali thus takes for granted that modern society is filled with infinitely more social justice than

that which prevailed during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet, and Western civilization has reached that "consummation of human liberty" as never attained by Islamic society. In other words, he means that Islamic legislation, on such questions as slavery, was deliberately left by our Holy Prophet as incomplete for which God destined modern Western civilization to supersede and improve upon! The Shariah permits the enslavement of war-prisoners during *Jihad*, providing for their rights to humane treatment. In modern times, slavery has been abolished only on paper while actually persisting in far worse forms under other labels. The millions of prisoners, incarcerated for no crime in forced labour camps under Hitler and Stalin, were tortured to death without any legal protection whatever.

> Muslims have been charged with their backwardness in painting and sculpture but it must be borne in mind that the prohibition contained in the Quran....is but a continuation of the Mosaic Law....and its significance rests upon the inveterate idolatry of the pre-Islamic Arabs. But with the gradual development of the primitive commonwealth into a civilized and cultivated empire and with the ascendancy of learning und science, the **Moslems grasped the spirit of this prohibition and cast off the fetters of a narrow literalism**....Hence, throughout the Moslem world, a taste for painting and sculpture arose simultaneously with the progress of literature and science. The palaces of the Caliphs, the mansions of the sovereigns who followed in their footsteps and the houses of the grandees were decorated with pictures and statues....(pp. 587-388)

The author, shorn of his usual flowery verbage, means to say that idolatry is a relic of the remote past for which there is no danger of its revival in such

a sophisticated and refined society as today. Since this evil in all its forms allegedly is dead, he argues that the Prophet's prohibition no longer applies!

In like manner do these apologists for Islam attempt to convince their admirers that the Islamic state makes no distinction between its Muslim and non-Muslim subjects, that the penalty of death for apostasy and stoning as punishment for adultery are only perverted *Fatwas* of bigoted jurists. They even go so far as to prettify Hell when our Holy Quran and Ḥadith tell us in no uncertain terms exactly what Hell is like and who is going there. Muhammad Ali (d. 1951), the former head of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Lahore, in his book *The Religion of Islam*, thus employs all the sophistry of the Mutazilites in a most unconvincing attempt to prove that unbelievers and hypocrites are not condemned to eternal damnation, but that Hell is merely a "reformatory", its punishment only a "remedial" measure and after the unbelievers have been sufficiently purified and cleansed by the fires of Hell, they all shall eventually enter Paradise!* While even the most cultivated Muslim elite has fallen prey to this intellectual and spiritual dishonesty, the intelligent non-Muslim Westerner is not deceived. He knows that apologetics is nothing more than sheer intellectual defeatism and a camouflage for religious skepticism. The Muslim who feels compelled to defend Islam on the basis of foreign criteria is only advertising to the non-Muslim world that he no longer believes in it.

---

*pp. 307-314.

"An appreciation of (apologetics) is altogether basic to any understanding of recent Muslim interpretation. For an almost overwhelming proportion of current Muslim religious thinking comes under this heading....The prevalence of apologetics is widespread. From Durban to Lahore, from Teheran to Jakarta, it has for fifty or more years been appearing in a steady stream....(The purpose of apologetics) is not to re-think Islam but to re-think its defences. Even in Ameer Ali's (*Spirit of Islam*), the defensive note is clear. He was primarily an advocate defending the cause of Islam before the bar of Western opinion....The output of apologetics has not been creative or dynamic. Yet it was satisfying. It served to soothe the conscience of those many thousands who chose to live or found themselves living Westernized lives and yet would have been unhappy at (the thought) of abandoning Islam....(Apologetics) not only allowed a liberal to (remain within the fold of Islam); it more and more invited, insisted (that a Muslim be 'liberal!')....Socially and historically all this has been of great immediate significance. Intellectually, however, the price paid has been enormous. And the indirect social and historical consequences accordingly are vast....In so far....as thinkers and writers have succumbed to the apologist tendency, there is very serious danger....in a tendency to view Islam....not as an imperative that places on man the responsibility to strive, but rather as a system that relieves him of that responsibility....The basic (pitfall) of apologetics is that it has diverted the attention of contemporary Islamic thinkers from their central task—the central task of all thinkers—to pursue truth and to solve problems. A lack of integrity always leads to disintegration and any failure of intellectual integrity in a society raises the threat of disastrous intellectual disintegration....For apologetics has quickly turned romantic and self-indulgent. ....Many an apologist exposition of Islam aims not at implementation but (merely) applause...Defense (has

become) pretense. For those who have lost touch with transcendence, apologetics becomes an intellectualized self-righteousness of one's community and its past.... (pp. 85-87).

Let us....consider the question of history....in terms of the mordant feeling of contemporary decline. The more acutely is felt the inadequacy of one's present, the more one insists on the splendor of one's past. For those dubious of Islam as a sufficient or effective ideal today, the endeavor is pushed hard to show that in the past it was spectacularly so. The more insecure one's faith, the more imperious the drive to argue for this....It seeks not to analyze or to understand the past but (merely) to glorify it; that is, to glorify one's self. The purpose is not investigation but aggrandizement; not intellectual accuracy but emotional satisfaction....Present "backwardness" is thus offset by past achievement (pp. 120-22)....

It is important to note how strikingly the spirit of the defence is Westernizing. Islam is defended not only against Western disparagment; it is defended also by means of Western approval....For instance, Muslims who are slack in their ritual prayer are confronted with a foreign acknowledgement of its value....The simultaneous repulsion and attraction in relation to the modern West is profound and indicates....sufficient involvement in a community's lack of self-confidence that a good opinion of Europe is a matter of deep concern for them....At a more basic level, it stems from an inability to form and live by genuine value judgments of one's own (pp. 140-1)....So keen is (the apologist) to satisfy doubters by using Western criteria that paradoxically, a marked irreligiousness permeates almost all (of this) defence....(p. 146).

In fact....a case could be made out that these (apologetic) writings are really functioning for readers who in the most profound, most religious sense are not Muslims but *ex-Muslims*; (who) are (or want to be) proud of their

heritage and desperately need reassurance in a hostile world (p. 146)....(Apologetics) is essentially *destructive* (because it) attempts to make use of religion for human purposes....Islam for the apologetes is....becoming rather an instrument in the personality's or society's pursuit of its own purpose—in this case, of self-esteem and emotional security....We contend further that this losing touch with the heart of the faith has worked to the grievous detriment of both persons and society. Yet this losing touch has been in large part unconscious; it is in the name of Islam that the apologetes have disrupted their own and others' faith....

—*Islam in Modern History*, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, op. cit., pp. 120-122.

It should be sufficiently clear to the reader at this stage why the apologetic interpretation of Islam is ruining us both individually and collectively and the more we are led on to pursue this line of reasoning, the weaker we shall become.

It is said that there is just now the need to change the social laws of Islam. But so long as we ignore and violate the strictly moral and religious laws of Islam, we cannot be expected to have much respect for its social laws (either)....Therefore, we cannot be in a position to judge....how the social laws of Islam ought to be changed or whether they ought to be changed at all. **Our present desire for *Ijtihad* is not the outcome of a love for Islam; it is the outcome of a concealed hatred for it and a covert admiration for other ideologies.** ....Its object is not to discover and explain the foundation of Islam as it is but merely to bring it as close as possible to other ideologies for the satisfaction of their admirers.... It is not genuine *Ijtihad*, not a natural and spontaneous growth out of the Shariah at all but only replacement of Islam by other ideologies of our liking as much as possible.

"The Task of Islamic Research," Dr. Mohammad Rafi-ud-din, *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, August 2, 1963.

An Islamic renaissance cannot take place until we have the courage to dissociate ourselves and sever identification and dependence upon modern Western civilization and all it stands for. As no man can serve two masters, it is equally impossible to serve two conflicting ideologies at once. One must choose either one or the other. One cannot owe allegiance to both. This aloofness from modern civilization does not involve so much physical isolation as complete spiritual and intellectual independence. We must demonstrate this independence by putting an end, once and for all, interpreting Islam through foreign criteria. We must summon the courage to stand up and defend an *unadulterated* Islam without worrying one whit whether non-Muslims like it or not. We must realize why no interpretation of Islam by any non-Muslim can ever be acceptable to us because he is compelled to judge according to values which are not ours. Thus a Hindu can only see Islam with a Hindu mind, a Buddhist with a Buddhist mind, a Jew with a Jewish mind, a Christian with a Christian mind, an agnostic humanist with the values of liberal secularism and a Communist with the philosophy of dialectical materialism. In the realm of ethical and spiritual values, it is psychologically impossible to be impartial or objective. Each must necessarily judge the other in conformity with his own mental outlook.

Islam does not view history in terms of worldly "progress" and "retrogression," but transcendental good and evil. Truth is absolute, divine and eternal

—not evolutionary or man-made, limited to time, place or circumstance. In the Quranic conception of history, Adam, the first man, was a genuine Prophet of God, a Muslim practising the purest monotheism. According to the Darwinian interpretation of history, Adam was half-ape, a naked savage living in a cave no better than an animal. The contrast is so self-evident that no further comment is necessary.

Why has modern Western civilization conquered the world? We Muslims have taken for granted that because we have been a defeated people, we must be inferior in every respect. Although this psychological reaction is perfectly natural and understandable, nothing could be further from the truth. Modern Western civilization owes such worldly success as it has achieved, not to any intrinsic merit of its cultural values but because of the frantic, single-minded determination to acquire the maximum power, wealth, comfort and pleasure in the shortest possible time. For the attainment of these ends, all other considerations were sacrificed or subordinated. In other words, the Western world owed its domination to the fact that it knew what it wanted and spared no effort to get it, combined with a supreme self-confidence of future triumph. If we Muslims were as self-confident in the superiority of Islamic ideals and as single-mindedly determined to implement them, nothing would stand in our way.

It is not Islam but **we** who must change. As soap washes clothes, we come into Islam dirty and emerge from its discipline—clean !!

WHY MODERNISM MUST FAIL !

In the last decade since I have embraced Islam, I have witnessed a most hopeful change of attitude in the ranks of intelligent and responsible Muslims. When I was nineteen years old back in 1953 and first began to study what Islamic literature was available in English, the tone of the arguments was invariably apologetic. Most of the writings took Sir Syed Ameer Ali 's "*Spirit of Islam*" for their model. Inferiority complex vis-a-vis the West, skepticism and defeatist mentality prevailed. But now, thanks to the influence of three independent movements working for the renaissance of our faith and way of life—the *Jama'at-e-Islami* of Pakistan, the *Ikhwan al-Muslimun* of the Arab world and the followers of Badee-u-Zaman Said Nursi in Turkey—modernism among the Muslims is now almost everywhere on the retreat and renaiscent Islam on the offensive. While the churches in the Western world are introducing "pop" music and guitars and teen-age "jive" dancing into their services of worship and making official proclamations that promiscuous and perverted sex "can be more fulfilling than marriage" and Christian and Jewish theologians are wrangling over such questions as whether God should be regarded as dead, almost all honest and sincere Muslims appreciate the modernist movement for what it is—spiritual blasphemy which, in denying the authority of transcendental absolute moral values, assumes that man is wiser than God ; intellectual dishonesty—

committed by making alien criteria the final judge of our faith to mutilate it beyond recognition, thus annulling all its original teachings and moral cowardice which refuses to frankly acknowledge the fact of outright disbelief and lacks the courage to defend their convictions and principles. Instead of making any effort to fight Evil, they choose instead to compromise, yield and adopt it as their own ! For these reasons the average Muslim in humble circumstances has nothing but contempt for the modernists for who can respect dishonesty, hypocrisy and cowardice ?

Although there is plenty of evidence of the impact of Western culture in all Muslim countries, it must be borne in mind that in every case, westernization has been arbitrarily, imposed, often, as in the case of Turkey and Iran, by force.* There is no Muslim land where Westernization began as a natural, spontaneous, popular movement. One can scarcely find a single modernist in the Muslim world who is an independent scholar. Almost all, with few exceptions, are connected directly with the Government where they receive their moral and material support. Their heretical writings and pronouncements make them the most despised men in the country. Who can like what they have done except the ruling elite, the free-masons, the Western orientalists and the Christian missionaries? When it is no secret, even to the most ignorant and illiterate where the rot is coming from, how can

---

*For a good appraisal of the impact of modernism and the persecution of Islam by the government, see: "Observations in Turkey and Iran," Ibn Batuta Saleh, *Al-Ittihad*, The Muslim Students Association of the United States and Canada, winter 1974, pp. 16-21.

there be any mystery why the modernist movement in Muslim lands has failed so miserably?

Viewed in historical retrospect, the modernist movement in the Muslim world was merely the natural psychological reaction to European imperialist domination. The first outstanding effort to stem the destructive tide of apologetics and expound the teachings of Islam in relation to modern thought and contemporary problems without yielding its principles was Prince Said Halim Pasha's ISLAMASHLAQ, the slogan of which was: "Islamize—not Europeanize!" This book, written just before its author's assassination in 1921, expounds the necessity for the supremacy of the Shariah as the only effective law for Turkey as a modern state. The second epoch-making book in defence of the Islamic movement, which was quickly made available in English, was Allama Muhammad Asad's ISLAM AT THE CROSSROADS which he, as a European convert, wrote in 1934. Its arguments in refutation of Western culture and the superiority of Islam have never been equalled or surpassed in any other work. During the dictatorship of Kemal Ataturk, the most fearless of all Muslims in Turkey to uphold the Islamic way of life was Badee-u-Zaman Said Nursi. During his long periods of imprisonment, he wrote his masterly commentary on the Quran, known as the *Risala-e-Noor*, which is avidly read, discussed and acted upon by thousands of devoted followers from all parts of Turkey. God did not abandon the Arab world to the forces of evil but sent as its *Mujaddid* and moral reformer, Shaikh

Hassan al-Banna who founded the *Ikhwan al-Muslimun*. Although Shaikh Hássan al-Banna was assassinated in 1949 and his movement has been banned in Egypt since 1954, its influence is still immense throughout the Arabic-speaking world. Then there are independent scholars of the intellectual integrity and erudition of Maulana Abul Hassan Ali Nadwi, Syed Hossein Nasr and Dr. Muhammad Hamidullah whose valuable research on the origins of the Hadith and the development of Islamic law have been the most effective refutation of Orientalists like Schacht and Gibb. For three decades in the first half of this century, Allama Iqbal devoted all his poetic genius to expounding the superiority of Islam, the evils of Western culture and arousing the Muslims from their apathy and lethargy. Indeed, Allama Iqbal is the only poet in the contemporary Muslim world who has been able to present the message of Islam in poetry of enduring artistic merit. The most prolific writer and indefatigable worker for the movement towards Islamic renaissance was Maulana Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi who is not only the author of a veritable library of books and pamphlets but also the founder of an organized movement to translate his precepts into practice. Increasingly the works of these scholars and their followers are being translated and made available in English and other Western languages. These men are no fanatics or bigots but are always prepared to allow the other side a fair hearing before they attack the fallacies of the materialists and carefully argue out their case. Their writings are

characterized by simple, lucid, forceful but always decent language, and by clear, consistent, straightforward and honest thinking. Their arguments are rational, logical and based upon irrefutable factual evidence. They approach their subject with a balanced judgment and sober mind—all hallmarks of superior scholarship. Most encouraging of all, female writers* are beginning to step forward and express themselves courageously upholding Purdah, polygamy and all the family laws of the Shariah pertaining to women and pointing out the necessity of their preservation and relevance in the modern age. Where the intelligent and educated Muslim woman was only a mere decade ago so ashamed, she is now proud and confident.

Periodicals devoted to the cause of the renaissance of an unadulterated Islam—dailies, weeklies and monthlies—are springing up everywhere—in Arabic, Urdu, Turkish and English—not only in the Muslim-majority countries but also in England, South Africa and America. Most of them must contend with severe financial difficulties and are often the object of official suppression. Some have gone bankrupt and forced to stop publication while others have been banned, but there is never any dearth of new journals to replace them.

Muslim students in Europe and America are increasingly growing anxious to preserve their unique identity and perpetuate and propagate their faith. In every major western city, Muslim students are organ-

---

*See *Iman*—the Source of my Courage", Shule Yuksel Shenler, columnist for the now banned Turkish daily, *Bugun*, *The Muslim*, London, April 1970, pp. 152-154.

"Goals for a Muslim Mother", Fatima Heeren-Sarka, German convert), *The Muslim*, London, March 1970, pp. 123-126.

izing their own societies to provide facilities for Salat, Jūma prayers, Halal food and congenial companionship. Some Muslim students are trying hard to make Islam better understood and appreciated by their Jewish and Christian fellow class-mates, teachers and professors. These Muslim student societies hold regular meetings, lectures, debates and some publish their own periodicals where Islam is expounded in a manner comprehensible to the modern mind and relevant to modern problems without sacrificing any of its doctrine, simply because it conflicts with the prevailing thought. What a happy contrast is this with the general attitude of Muslim students in the West only a few years ago. How well I remember the debates of the Muslim Student Association at Columbia University in New York I attended during my own college days when hours would be wasted in wrangling over such futile questions as whether the Quranic prohibition of swine-flesh, wine and the ban on interest-taking should be repealed to suit the conditions of modern life !

Scholars and writers working for renaiscent Islam are courageous and ready for any personal sacrifice to uphold their convictions. Thus even those who disagree with them, respect and admire their courage, integrity and perseverance. Modernists are characterized by sophistry, verbal hair-splitting, deliberate distortion of terms from their true meanings and mental confusion. Thus, even from the stand point of purely literary value and scholarship, their works cannot rise above mediocrity. These qualities cannot fail to render renaiscent Islam successful where modernism must fail.

APPENDIX

Those in power, both in the East and the West, are trying to destroy the genuine Islam by substituting a counterfeit "modern," "liberal" and "progressive" version manufactured by the orientalists and Christian missionaries in London and New York. The same gimmics, adopted by the Church and Synagogue to attract the fun-oriented new generation, are now being copied in some "Muslim" circles,* supported by strong vested interests.

Re-elected to her second term as President of the Federation of Islamic Associations in the United States and Canada, Zehia Khalil kept a watchful eye over the 22nd Annual Convention of the organization in Detroit. Projecting an image of authority over a group unaccustomed to having a woman in position of leadership, it was apparent that Mrs. Khalil had kept one of her promises she made last year after her election—to re-activitate the youth : the young people were there, dancing to the deafening sounds of a hard-rock band till three o'clock in the morning each night in the grand ballroom of the old comfortable Detroit Hilton Hotel. "Zee", as she likes to be called by her young followers, is convinced that this is the way to attract the young Muslims to events which center around preserving the religion of Islam in North America.

"F.I.A.-22nd Annual Convention, over to the Youth," *Impact International Fortnightly*, London, September 14-27, 1973, p. 15.

***For a documented, detailed description of these abomidable practices see: *The Arab Moslems in the United States : Religion and Assimilation*, Abdo A. Elkholy, College and University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, 1966.**

The secularization and modernization of Muslims is not confined to the West. The craze has taken just as strong a hold in the East.

On the way to the Defence Housing Society in Karachi, an enormous concrete bubble assails the eye, causing one to start a bit and look again. This is the 200 foot wide dome of the Society's new mosque now under construction. Designed by Babar and Associates, the mosque was started in August 1966 and is expected to be complete in December 1968, this year. It is a huge structure which will be surrounded by spacious terraced gardens and once complete, will hold, it is estimated, about 25,000 people. But its size is not its only distinctive feature—and certainly not its most controversial one. What everyone is talking about is the dome, which in fact covers the entire 200 foot diameter prayer hall. It is somewhat like the dome of the State Bank Building now going up in Islamabad—except that dome is built on steel ribs and this one is supported by a cage with the steel bars hooked to the bars in the walls and meeting at the top. The old style cupolas, constructed, without the aid of steel, were proportioned in such a way that the walls took the entire weight. Thus there had to be a certain height in order to balance their width. If such a dome were built over this particular hall, it would have to be more than 100 feet high. The present dome is only 56 feet high because its weight is borne by the steel. And it is precisely the low-slung proportions of the dome which are provoking people to express themselves rather firmly on the subject. Some liken it to a cake; others think it looks like a shallow steel helmet; still others say it reminds them of museums they have seen abroad. Many are very enthusiastic about it. In short, people are talking about it.

But let me describe the mosque in more detail. You enter between high shady walls into an oldstyle entrance hall and then come out into a stretch of paved ground which has the ablution tanks on either side and a long pool in the centre.

Stone benches will be fitted along the tanks so that the people can reach up comfortably to the taps. You come out onto the gallery and the only minaret comes into view. It is 120 feet tall and is attached somewhat artificially to the main structure by a platform and stairs. Looking more like a tower than a minaret, it seems rather incongruous with the rest of the building. The most outstanding feature, which other mosques might do well to adopt, is the comfortable two-bed-roomed house provided for the Khatib and adjoining it, a school room and a children's library set away from the main edifice at one end of the garden. Future plans envisage a hostel for foreign Muslim students and a research library.

Karachi's new mosque—it will cost 28 to 30 hundred thousand rupees by the time it is finished—promises to be fairly interesting, perhaps even impressive.

We Pakistanis have a tendency to be suspicious of anything new. Perhaps because we have had so much in the past that was worthwhile and admirable, we expect things of the present day to measure up to what has gone-by. So we end up emulating the old—and what was original in its own time be omes hackneyed in ours. Even if we could today produce gems of architecure like the Badshahi Mosque or the Moti Masjid, o name but two—the old-fashioned style would hardly be representative of the existing age and would certainly not be a product of our times. So what is the answer ? Encourage originality whenever you can and give the twentieth-century a chance to express itself !

"A Twentieth Century Mosque," Nasreen Azhar, *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, June 2, 1968.

The series of articles which now follows, all quoted from *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore, adequately represent the prevailing views of our so-called "intelligentsia" of the attitude Muslims should take regarding modern civilization.

In Search of an Ideology, Dr. S. M. Abdullah (Oct. 27, 1962).

A research institute has been formed by the Central Government to re-study Islamic literature with the object of constructing an exact view of Islam....for the sake of *adjusting Islamic teachings to the dictates of modern times.* The step is timely because Pakistan is destined to play an important role in the new world, politically as well as culturally, being the only country which stands committed to the preservation and promotion of certain religious values which can help humanity achieve its goals of glory and salvation.

The objectives laid down for the above mentioned Research Institute are decidingly *noble* and one feels that the Institute will be called upon to answer several questions of prime importance before it could chalk out any solid program of achieving its aims and objects. One big question is: *What should be the criteria of determining what is sound and what is unsound in the vast literature produced during the last thirteen centuries of Islam?* There is still another question: *What are the principles for judging which parts of the modern civilization are acceptable or unacceptable to us as Muslims?* These questions presented no difficulty to our forefathers who could unhesitatingly declare: "The Book of God and the practice of the Holy Prophet are sufficient for us." But the present generation demands a definite answer to all these questions

One important question in this connection might be: What are the dictates of modern times which Islam is to satisfy and what are the special features of (the modern way of) life with which Islam should be harmonized?

The dictates of modern times (above all)....mean (the) *cultivation of a scientific attitude towards life*....Without using cumbersome terminology, I would prefer to be simple and say that a scientific view of life would be positive in nature, constructive in composition and fruitful in the end. Again, it depends on observation, analysis and experiment and does not rely on mere speculation and intellectual enjoyment. *It is utilitarian in essence.* Reason is the starting point of science but it does not depend upon Reason alone; experiment is necessary for grasping the Reality. *The scientific view insists on material considerations alone and refuses to look beyond the world of matter.* Such an attitude does not entertain moral and spiritual values; although it is not necessarily immoral, at the most *it is amoral.* **The present life, according to (the scientific) view, is the only life and there is nothing after this. Nature has no ethic and does not recognize good from bad; it has its own laws. Man, whether created by God or by dead matter, has to create conditions by himself conducive to health and happiness without the intervention** of **any superior power....**

Baring....(its)....denial of God and the Revelation, ...the remainder (of this philosophy) may be (profitably) adopted with slight modifications because the attitude of Islam toward worldly life is positive and practical....It may be added that Islam is more interested in scientific truth than in the philosophic.[1]....Perhaps this is the reason why Muslims have favored the Aristotelian position more than the Platonic version of truth although a balance was

1. All scientific, factual truth must be accepted by Muslims and put to the best use for the cause of Islam but the philosophical speculations, such as the theories of Darwin and Freud, that Western scientists have derived from atheism must be rejected.

be considered the outcome of his unbalanced temper or defective education....All these things are sentimental.... and have no sanction of religion behind them so far as Islam is concerned....

This is an analysis of the conditions of modern life and in such conditions, efforts to adjust things in Pakistan are urgently needed. The atmosphere around us should be examined critically and a pattern of life not hostile to our tradition must be evolved through balanced evaluation on national and ideological lines....We cannot cut ourselves off from the dictates of modern life but equally we cannot afford to sever our ties with our tradition and history....In short, competent scholars are required to reinterpret Islam in the context of modern life....and in this respect we have the example of Iqbal whose slogan was : "Back to Islam, back to the Holy Quran", and yet he never ignored the principles of modern life. Modern life has to be analyzed before *we accept it* with all its implications....

Educational Reforms: Their Philosophy and Salient Features, A. H. Kadar (Dec. 1962).

....It is impossible to exaggerate the historical importance of the United Nations Development Decade. *For the first time in human history, the nations of the world have established as their common purpose a sustained and combined effort to create conditions of economic (prosperity) that will ultimatety lead to the elimination of poverty throughout the world.* The aspirations of the developing countries to provide their people with a decent standard of living are a striking new feature of the modern world. Equally dramatic is the solidarity of nations that makes possible a great co-operative effort in this field. If the objectives laid down by the General Assembly in its Resolution on the Development Decade are achieved, the standard of living of the under-developed countries should be doubled in the next 20 or 30 years and a foundation laid for further self-sustained economic growth.

maintained by the mystic thinkers who favored Platonism in most things....

The culture of a nation is a sociological process born out of its social, political, economic and ideological experiences. Western culture has its own social, historical, geographical and climatic background. Hence it has its own peculiarities.... *The underlying ideas of European culture are....utility, practicality, efficiency,....artistic urge, quest for happiness and freedom from anything or everything which stands in the way of happiness.*[2] Some important features of the European culture are the result of technological progress. The crave for freshness, novelty and originality is also molding the European modes of life....The ever-changing temper of the society in European cities may be attributed to literary or philosophical revolts coming in the wake of frequent political upheavals. All these factors have joined in building the edifice of what is called "European culture"....

European modes are not all bad ; some of them are excellent. We have learned much from the Europeans who have also reminded us of some of our own forgotten principles of life. The organizational capacity, discipline, punctuality, regularity,....love of practicality, humanism, ...proper interest in the present (worldly) life....and quest for truth are some of the most important (Western) ideals which must be respected and assimilated because these are in complete consonance with the spirit of Islam.... From the point of view of adjustment as seen from the angle of our particular ideology, there is no harm in adopting foreign ways of life *that add to our comfort, our efficiency and fullness of life.* Nobody should and can object to the variety of dresses and the various forms of permitted (Western) drinks and dishes, and if anybody does, it may

2. This is the philosophy of *Hedonism* advanced by certain ancient Greek and Roman philosophers, proclaiming that worldly pleasure ("fun") and self-indulgence is the whole purpose of life. Modern American life is based on this same philosophy. *Hedonism* is the antithesis of Islam!

The philosophy behind the declaration of the United Nations Development Decade....(is)....that there can be no peace in the world when there are a few affluent nations and the majority of them are poor.[3] There can be no meeting ground between nations at two different stages of development. Recognizing that there is a gap between the resources of different countries and that this gap is primarily due to the scientific and technological attainments of the developed countries, the need for transmitting these skills to developing nations as speedily as possible has been recognized. The scientific and technological skills which transformed Western civilization were acquired over a period of nearly a hundred years. The newly emerged countries have not only to acquire these skills but also to keep pace with the rapid advances that are being made in the fields of science and technology. This yawning gap has to be filled as quickly as possible.

Technical training, like the economic progress which it helps to promote, has no value except as a necessary instrument for the material liberation of man. In modern industrial society, there is an essential need for a sufficiency of trained men and *women* not only in industry but also in commerce, administration and the professions. A first-class training in applied science and technology is at the very least likely to make one more aware of the virtues of precision and accuracy and to strengthen one's respect for *objective* truth....There seems to be little doubt that progress in technical education is closely bound up with progress in general education at primary and secondary school levels. It is the experience in almost all the advanced countries that those who have received the best general education in

3. It is utterly fallacious to assume that economic prosperity based on technological progress can by itself assure world peace. A glaring illustration is that of Germany, one of the most highly literate, economically prosperous and scientifically advanced of all countries, which was responsible for both world wars--the bloodiest conflicts in history. Economic development and literacy certainly do not necessarily imply moral progress. Quite often it leads to the opposite results accompanied by more strife and unrest than ever.

accordance with their abilities and aptitudes, make the most rapid and satisfactory progress when they move on to a technical course.

With this brief introduction to the role of education as a primary factor in the development of social and economic resources of a country, we can now move on to deal with the salient features of the educational reforms.

The publication in 1959 of *The Report of the Commission on National Education* represented a water-shed in the development of education. To bring out the full significance of the wind of change in education in Pakistan, I should like to quote the following passage from the resolution of the Government of Pakistan on the Reforms recommended by the Commission on National Education. On the broad policy reform recommended by the Commission, the Government specifically recorded its endorsement of the following:

"Education should be viewed as a productive activity and as an investment in human resources essential for the development of a progressive and prosperous welfare state.[4] Compulsory primary education and vigorous efforts in adult education are essential for the creation of a literate nation, an alert citizenry, the proper function of political democracy and the ability of a nation to comprehend and apply technical knowledge. Secondary education is the source of the main body of the educated community. It is in the universities that the leaders of engineering, agriculture, the business community and government services receive their education. Particular emphasis is to be laid on the necessity of making adequate provision for the training of scientific and technical personnel at all levels."

Education, to be productive, must be of the right type. Our education so far has been unduly bookish, theoretical

---

4. Note that the report does not include any religious instruction and gives Islam no place in our Pakistani schools and colleges. So long as this philosophy of *pure and naked materialism* prevails, an Islamic renaissance is impossible.

and not directly relevant to the needs of the nation. The reforms attempted to remedy this defect are: "At the primary stage, children should deal not only with reading, writing and arithmetic but also do some work with their hands, acquire basic skills and be encouraged to take an intelligent interest in their surroundings. At the secondary level, drastic reorganization is essential. The curriculum now has a core of compulsory subjects in which science, mathematics and practical skills play an important part. In addition to the compulsory subjects, there is a provision for a series of options, particularly in the fields of industrial arts, agriculture, home economics and commercial skills. This curriculum would enable successful diversion of students to vocational and commercial education at the appropriate stages...."

The pursuit of quality in our educational system has also dominated the thinking of the Commission. With the advent of freedom, Pakistan is now thrown into competition with the rest of the world. The United Kingdom, United States and Soviet Union have, because of their eminence in the field of education, science and technology, built up high standards of living for their people. If we are to live in dignity, we must also acquire a comparable efficiency in education, science and technology......One of the most important impacts of the Report has been its influence on the Second Five Year Plan. In particular, its major contribution lies in the formulation by the Planning Commission of two important generalizations, namely: *that no illiterate country has ever achieved significant economic development and, secondly, that an educated community with highly trained leadership does not remain economically backward*......The Commission has laid down that the end products of our educational system should be comparable to the best products of the British, American and Russian systems. The target is very high but in this age of ruthless competition, we cannot prescribe a lower criterion of excellence.

Our Language Problem needs a Radical Outlook, *by Mohammad Afzal Hussain, Revolution Day Supplement, October* 27, 1964 *and October* 27, 1967.

Revolutions, although they start as sudden changes in governments, usually lead to radical changes in several directions and not unusually, attitudes of the people alter.... On this Revolution Day, let us take stock of what revolutions we have been able to bring about. How far has our mental attitude changed? Do we face facts of life, discarding restraints imposed by tradition? Are we slaves of outdated loyalties or do we study our problems with a fresh mind?

Our President, Muhammad Ayub Khan in "*Friends Not Masters*" reproduces from the memoranda he has maintaining after the October 1958 Revolution, the following: **"I mentioned to the Cabinet that the introduction of Roman script for all languages of Pakistan would help increase literacy and could result also in the creation of a common language. I wanted my colleagues to consider the problem dispassionately."** (p. 85).

A day before—December 30, 1958—the President had appointed "The Commission on National Education." The terms of reference included: "Examination of the question of adopting Roman script." The questionaire issued by the Commission included the following:
Do you favour adopting the Roman script in Pakistan?
Do you think that this step would—

(*i*) reduce the time required for making the masses literate?
(*ii*) reduce the load for school children in learning their second and third languages?
(*iii*) tend to produce a national language and so unify the nation;
(*iv*) facilitate the production of printed matter; and
(*v*) have any other far-reaching effects?[5]

One is not in a position to determine if the Cabinet colleagues

of the President considered the problem of adopting Roman script for the languages of Pakistan "dispassionately", but the Commission on National Education certainly did so. The thoroughness and impartiality with which the Commission dealt with this problem were commendable. The Commission confessed:

> "It should be noted that the arguments recorded....are not those of the Commission but represent in summarized form the evidence placed before it."..........

Let us examine our language problem with a revolutionary objective outlook....The acutest problem which faces Pakistan is the removal of illiteracy. Over 85% of the population are absolutely illiterate and of the remainder, a large proportion is at best semi-literate......There is the urgent necessity of experimentation in Pakistan with our limited resources of teachers and money for adult education, we should try and find quick methods of fighting illiteracy[6] among those who are beyond the school-going age.

Suggestions have been made time and time again that the Roman script . . . be adopted for the Pakistani languages . . . We have very close associations with Turkey and the great leader, Ataturk, had introduced the Roman script and used to go about with blackboards and chalk and explain the system to the people. It is claimed that Turkey has successfully fought the curse of illiteracy through this system....[7] We may also study the position in Indonesia and Malaysia, the two Muslim countries who have

5. The "other far-reaching effects" of adopting Roman script for Pakistani languages would make the Holy Quran in Arabic utterly unintelligible for the new generations, alienate our youth permanently from all the Islamic literature in Arabic script, rendering our present Urdu a dead language and and sever all the ties of the young with their Islamic past.

6. Adoption of Roman script does not automatically facilitate literacy. Japan, which has retained a much more difficult alphabet, based on the Chinese, to learn than the Arabic, is practically 100% literate while Turkey, which adopted the Roman letters forty years ago, still has a very high percentage of illiteracy.

7. More than half the adult population of Turkey is still illliterate. Lebanon, which has retained Arabic, is the most highly literate country in the Middle East.

adopted Roman script . . . We in Pakistan and lovers of Urdu in India are seriously concerned about the future of this language in that country. If Roman script is adopted for Urdu, this language cannot die. The English language will live in India for a long time, if not for ever, and any language which has a similar script will persist. If we have the wisdom to see into the future, *we should not hesitate to adopt Roman script for all Pakistani languages.* This will be the best way to bring the languages of the East and West Pakistan closer together and a new Pakistani language may evolve through this common garb. This needs a revolutionary outlook.

Having discussed the problem of general literacy, and the place of Urdu as a working common medium, the next stage is to be considered. This is the stage of higher education—university education—in humanities, sciences and technology. We must remember that it is not the mere numbers of graduates that matter but excellence of the production which the developing nation needs . . For some 400 years, we have not contributed in any significant degree to the world's original thought in humanities, science or technology. We have been left far behind in the race for intellectual progress. We have to struggle very hard to make up the ground lost and keep pace with the rapid march forward in every field that is taking place. The speed of fresh achievements is so fast that it has been stated with much justification that the amount of new knowledge which man has acquired during the last fifty years is more than what man had accumulated during the previous 5,000 years. Just think of one new discovery—atomic energy. What fresh avenues the splitting of the smallest particle of matter opens for human progress!

Carried away by emotions of the love of "mother tongue"—an unscientific attitude—there is a rush to adopt Urdu as the medium of instruction up to the highest stage of education. In a world moving so fast, is it wise to be slow because our mother tongue has fallen behind? For

higher thought we must employ a world language. We have the advantage that English is such a language.[8] As an independent country, we have to establish world-wide contacts and take part in the deliberations of international bodies. As members of the Commonwealth we have the advantage of a common language of the Commonwealth. We have the advantage that this is the language of the U.S.A., a progressive country. What is the language we employ in conferences with our close friends, Iran and Turkey?

In our language policy we must not be retarded by tradition. We must have revolutionary ideas. The imaginary picture of "our culture" is painted to decoy our intellect. No one knows what culture is. The present-day world is shrinking because of faster and faster means of communication. Culture is becoming international. Dress as well as food are becoming international. Means of transport are similar all over the world. "Teddyism" has become international. A culture that ignores these world influences cannot persist.

The Governor of West Pakistan has appointed a Committee of eighteen headed by Mr. Justice S. A. Rahman as regards the introduction of the *Naskh* Arabic script. The Committee consists of eminent scholars, journalists and educationalists. Let us hope that this Committee will adopt a revolutionary outlook . . . so that we steer a course which leads to progress forward and does not lead us backwards.

In Search of a Dynamic Womanhood (June 28, 1964).

When President Ayub, while recently inaugurating the Muslim League's Women's sub-committee, urged the women to "create a dynamic society," he was giving recognition to the fact that woman's influence on society can be most far-reaching. The late Pundit Nehru, speaking

8. Arabic is also an international, world language, indispensable as the basis for any genuine Islamic system of education. The adoption of English as the medium of instruction in our schools and colleges makes an Islamic renaissance impossible. English owes its dominance over the world today solely because of the political, military and economic supremacy of America. Once America is defeated on the battlefield by any non-Western power, such as China, the influence of English will rapidly decline.

on community development, said: "In order to awaken the people, it is the woman who has to be awakened. Once she is on the move, the household moves, the village moves, the community moves." Leaders in Asian and African countries realize that woman can be the greatest force in society, for ultimately the political and economic situation touches her in her role of citizen-rearing. Governments in undeveloped countries are promoting organized efforts to reach the women through education, health and other community services. Voluntary organizations reinforce Government efforts. But the problems are so great that the vast majority still live remote from change and modernization.

It is the older women—the custodians of tradition—whose cooperation must be tactfully sought before a new era is ushered in. They may not practise the changed way of life themselves but they need not frown upon it. Who has not heard many a sweet old grandmother talk of bygone days when children were—oh, so obedient and never came to dinner without a "*topi.*" But for all that, she will not disinherit her gum-chewing, jeans-wearing and rock and rolling progeny.

Pakistan's women present a diverse picture of backwardness, conservatism and penury side by side by emancipation, achievement and wealth. Women live all their lives shut up in mud hovels, never going beyond the surrounding fields. Fifteen miles from Lahore, they have never visited it. They speak of the city as though it were some far-away metropolis. On the other hand, our women have proved their mettle in many professional fields and have represented the country abroad in sports and at international moots. The United Nations Commission on the Status of Women has been chaired by a Pakistani delegate. "Stunning," "cute," "ball of fire," are some of the epithets Pakistani women have earned from admiring Westerners.[9]

---

9. **Thus it is shown that in modern society, a woman is little more than a man's toy. This is the kind of "respect" and "esteem" a Pakistani Muslim woman can expect from the West!**

"Are all the women from Pakistan so beautiful?" wailed one fat and dumpy Italian woman delegate at a conference in Copenhagen.

Education, the key to a social awakening, is still denied to millions. Without the stimulus of knowledge, Pakistani women will never play their part in development. Our women may yet be a far cry from the women of today's China who are equals with the men and because of identical dress, it is even said you cannot tell the difference; from the Soviet Union where women can be road-drillers and astronauts and the United States of America where the consumer market is woman-dominated. But these countries all had to evolve through problems and inhibitions before giving the women their present achievement. Given the requisite opportunities, nothing need prevent Pakistan's daughters from coming into their own.

Economic Development and Moral Values:
Professor C. A. Qadir (January 13, 1963)

In his presidential address to the ninth session of the Pakistan Philosophical Congress held at Rajshahi in January 1962, Mr. Mohammad Shoaib, Finance Minister, Government of Pakistan, observed that: **"To fulfil the rising aspirations in under-developed countries for a better, more secure, and more satisfying life, the concept of economic development has become in these countries, including our own, the primary goal of public policy."**

The Governments of less developed countries, taking their cue from the prosperity and affluence of the Western societies, have launched upon a program of technical and industrial progress in various sectors of their economy. Emphasis is being laid upon machines and more machines—machines of the most modern design embodying the latest results of technological research and scientific acumen. There are machines for small and large industries, there are machines for household comfort, there are machines for

irrigation, agriculture, for architecture, for medicine, even for contraceptives in Family Planning. That machines help in increasing the rate of economic growth and are conducive to human happiness, nobody ever denies. *What, however, is not understood is that the concept of economic development is a philosophy in itself and entails a profound revolution in social values and relationships.*

What kind of life is envisaged by the economic development program? What values are generated by material progress? What role has religion in a highly industrialized and technological society? Questions of this and kindred nature are very hard to answer....But one thing is clear. The future will not be the carbon copy of the present as the present was not a replica of the past. Each succeeding generation is substantially different from the previous one because of the enormous new factors which went into its making....Not only has an individual to think afresh.... but also nations in order to live effectively and successfully. It is for this reason that *the solutions of the previous ages will prove utterly inadequate for any succeeding age.*[10] The problems are never the same; their complexions are different; their implications are quite new. Nature never repeats itself, not at least the social nature. Multiformity is more obvious in the sphere of human relationships than anywhere else. ....*Hence it is not wise to look to the past or to rely on the solutions of the past. Retrospection is a sign of intellectual decadence* and is resorted to by nations who have not learned to stand on their own legs.

Another thing that is quite obvious is that in an industrialized society, *dogmatism, superstition and unexamined faith can have no place*... Consequently, one finds in (Europe) and America, theologians (of Jewish and Christian origin).... embarked on a task of reconstruction and reinterpretation

---

10. The siren song of modernism is that anything that is old must necessarily be obsolete. The complete relativity modern ethics frustrates any objective judgment of older systems on their intrinsic merits so that the good is indiscriminately discarded with the bad! How foolish!

on the lines set by modern thinking in various spheres of *human understanding. Religious truths are defended in the conceptual framework of the present and not of the past, however glorious and satisfying that past may be.*[11] Martin Buber, Tillich and Kierkgaard are only a few of the Western religious thinkers engaged in the task of reconstructing Christian and Jewish thought by the techniques of modern knowledge. In our country, Iqbal reconstructed Muslim thought in the light of knowledge available then. It would be a mistake to think that the work of reconstruction has come to an end. Human knowledge is ever on the move. There are fresh challenges, new problems and new questions which have to be grappled by the techniques of the present. . . . Martin Heideggar, the German Existentialist, says: "A faith that does not perpetually expose itself to the possibility of unfaith is no faith at all but merely a convenience when the believer simply makes up his mind to adhere to the traditional doctrine". . .

The values of a pastoral or feudal society cannot apply to a machine society . . . In Pakistan, as industrialization gets into pace, people will start questioning many of their cherished ideals. Many of the older values are already under fire. In college as well as universities, one can find among students a growing tendency to cross-examine every sort of evidence, including the religious one, and not to accept anything without sufficient and cogent grounds . . In addition to this liberal and humanistic tendency working towards a reassessment and consequent re-evaluation of old values, there are social forces let loose by urbanization, break-up of family ties and loosening of sex-morality which require fresh thinking. When men and women study together in universities, work side by side in offices and factories and

---

11. As a result, the most vulgar "pop" music and dancing is being introduced into the church and synagogue in America; clergymen are denying God, Hereafter, revelation and prophecy on principle and even debating the question as to whether God is dead! See feature article in *Time* magazine, "Is God dead?", April 8, 1966 and "Are you Disturbed by the New Religion?" *Reader's Digest*, March 1968.

compete in sports, examinations and jobs, *all sorts of things can be expected* . . . The modern girl of our university is vastly different from the girl of yesterday not only in dress, which is, after all, a thing of not much importance, but in her sense of moral appraisals, in her likes and dislikes and in her approvals and disapprovals. She cannot accept the idea of male superiority and refuses to be dominated by him. Through biology and psychology, she learns the idea of male and female equality. Biology tells her how each parent contributes an equal number of chromosomes to the child and psychology tells her how in intelligence quotient the female equals the male . . . It would be strange if, after learning such things, . . . our family continues to operate on the old ideas of male superiority and subordination (of the youth to the elders).[12] From male superiority, a shift has to be made in the direction of fellowship where each partner of life feels a sense of equality. When the family life feels the impact of liberal and democratic ideas, other values shall have to redefine themselves to make themselves acceptable . . . **It seems to me that one cannot have the benefits of modern civilization without sacrificing . . . .what was held noble and sublime in the past. . . . This is the price which every nation, keen to modernize itself, has to pay. . . .**

It should be remembered that the less-developed countries shall have to depend upon foreign aid and loans for the implementation of their welfare schemes. These schemes . . . involve huge expenditures which the under-developed countries find hard to pay for with their meagre resources and absence of technical skill. Besides, their population is increasing at an alarming rate. . . (Therefore) they need enormous sums of money which they must beg from states that have grown rich through the use of technology and cutthroat methods. Most of the rich countries are the

---

12. The breakdown of the family has resulted in a raging epidemic of juvenile delinquency, lawlessness, violence and universal indulgence in illicit sex. Consequently, the problem of venereal disease is more acute in the West than ever before. Is this what our modernizers want in Pakistan?

imperialists of yesterday who, with their superior military strategy and because of local internal dissensions, could exploit the unsophisticated and unlettered East to their heart's content. Hence it is the moral duty of those nations to bring up the exploited and the deprived to (standards of living equal to their own . . . The lenders are just paying back to the borrowers what they owe to them. Of course this does not mean that the borrowers should feel satisfied by their begging. *For begging is, after all, begging, and no amount of rationalization can turn it into self-respect.*

In addition to skepticism (regarding religious dogma), there will also come about much secularism and also humanism. Physical and social problems will not be understood in terms of transcendental (dogma) but in terms of (purely) human experience as challenges to human ingenuity and hence to be solved by methods of factual science in terms of concrete, mundane reality. This change is most significant. **Instead of relying on supernatural forces, the industrialized man will have to depend upon his own resources.**[13] *Thus religion will be shorn of its supernatural, superstititious aspect and irrational accretions which have gathered around it over the ages.* Broadly speaking, humanism is any view in which interest in human welfare is the (most important consideration in life). Humanist religion is simply a "shared quest for the good life" and social justice and social reform are to be stressed as important in religious endeavour. The idea of the welfare state and that of enlightened democracy follow from this concept.

It (now) appears that the old house has crumbled down and no new one has yet been built in its place. *No amount of return to the past can fill the vacuum.* The problems are new; life's demands are different and hence, a scheme

---

13. As a result of the domination of atheism, mental illness has become the scourge of the West. Nowhere are there more drug addiction and suicides than in affluent countries like America, Britain, West Germany and Sweden. Is this the "progress" we want?

> of life not sanctioned by present-day requirements, can have little chance of success. But skepticism and doubt must never be condemned. They act as the spur to fresh thinking as well as provide the incentive (which alone makes progress possible). Indeed, blessed are those who are assailed by doubt for they alone will break (the chains of) the past and march onward!

This is the ideology of those who are in control of the destiny of our country. It is indeed the ideology of the rulers of every country in the world without exception. I do not question the usefulness of this blind faith in materialism in leading us along the road to modernization or westernization. If we really want industrialization, technological progress, economic development and higher and higher standards of living to the exclusion of all the higher moral and spiritual values, then we must bid our faith in Islam farewell.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Philosophical Sources of Western Materialism :

Makers of the Modern Mind, Randall, Columbia University Press, New York, 1930.

Religion Without Revelation, Julian Huxley, New American Library, New York, 1957.

A Philosophical Interpretation of History, Mohammad Abdul Hameed Siddiqui, Idara Nashriyat-i-Islam, Lahore. 1969.

Islam in the Modern World, A. K. Brohi, Chiragh-e-Rah Publications, Karachi, 1968.

Ideology of the Future, Mohammad Rafi-ud-din, Din Muhammadi Press, Karachi, 1956.

**The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1962.

The purpose of these lectures, originally delivered at Hyderabad and Aligarh Universities in 1928 and then later collected, edited and published by his son, Javid Iqbal, is to reinterpret Islam in the light of contemporary European philosophies. The efforts of the learned author (who made great contributions through expounding the message of Islam and the plight of the Muslims in inspiring Persian and Urdu poetry of enduring artistic merit) to show the reader the alleged similarities between Islam and the theories of famous European philosophers (especially Bergson, Hegel, Kant and Nietzsche,) are unconvincing. This is one of the classic works of Muslim modernism where the author is guilty of misleading the reader with distorted interpertations of Quranic teachings and doctrine.

Modern Philosophy : Its Characteristics and Consequences :

Modernization: the Dynamics of Growth, Myron Weiner (editor), The Voice of America Forum Lectures, Washington D.C., 1966.

Future Shock, Alvin Toffler, Bantam Books, New York, 1970.

Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society, Eric and Mary Josephson (editors), Dell Publishing Co., New York, 1962.

Cultural Slavery is Inseparable from Political Slavery :

Our Indian Mussalmans· Are They Bound in Conscience to Rebel Against the Queen? William W. Hunter, Premier Book House, Lahore, 1871.

Modern Egypt, Lord Cromer (Sir Evelyn Baring), Macmillan, New York, 1908.

Seven Pillars of Wisdom, T. E. Lawrence, Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York, 1936.

"Slave Culture," Masih-uz-Zaman, *Muslimnews International*, Karachi, January 1974, pp. 26, 36-40.

"Cultural Segregation in Pakistan," Masih-uz-Zaman, *Muslim news International*, Karachi, May 1974, pp. 15-19.

Can Islam be Reconciled with the Spirit of the Twentieth Century ?

Islam at the Crossroads, Muhammad Asad (Leopold Weiss), Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore 1934.

Western Civilization, Islam and Muslims, Abul Hassan Ali Nadawi, Academy of Islamic Research and Publications, Lucknow, 1969.

Tanqihat, Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, Islamic Publications, Lahore, 1939.

Islam on the March, Mahmud Brelvi, published by the author, Karachi, 1968.

The Passing of the Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East), Daniel Lerner, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1958.

Islam in the Modern Age, Ilse Lichtenstadter, Bookmans, New York, 1958.

"The Western World and Its Challenges to Islam," Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *The Muslim*, London, January 1972, pp. 56-61, September-October 1972, pp. 6-11.

The Fallacy of Modernism :

Modern Trends in Islam, H. A. R. Gibb, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1945.

The most persuasive and convincing refutation of the pitfalls of Muslim modernism by a European orientalist.

Islam and Contemporary Heresies :

Islamic Law in the Modern World, J. N. D. Anderson, London, 1961.

This book clearly shows how the modernists have tampered with the Shari'ah to force it in line with modern Western legal norms in various Muslim countries.

Studies in the Family Law of Islam, Khurshid Ahmad (editor), Aisha Bawany Waqf, Karachi, 1961.

This book is of special interest to students and scholars on the bitter controversy for and against modernism in reinterpreting the personal family laws of the Shari'ah. In support of modernism, the entire text of the 1956 Marriage Commission Report led by the late Mian Abd-ur-Rashid, is included which on March 7, 1961 was enacted by the late President Ayub Khan under Martial Law as the infamous Pakistani Family Laws Ordinance. Maulana Amin Ahsan Islahi's detailed essay analying the fallacies of the modernist views on such questions as early marriage, polygamy, divorce, and inheritance is a masterpiece of exposition and criticism.

Modern Quranic Interpretation, J. M. S. Baljon, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1961.

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan : the Pioneer of Modernism in the Muslim World :

The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, J. M. S. Baljon, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1964.

The Religious Thought of Sayyid Ahmad Khan, Bashir Ahmad Dar, Institute of Islamic Culture, Lahore, 1957.

The Spirit of Unbelief: A Critical Analysis of "The Spirit of Islam" by Syed Ameer Ali.

**The Spirit of Islam*, Syed Ameer Ali, Christophers, London, 1922.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad : the Champion of Nationalism and Secularism in Muslim India :

Abul Kalam Azad: A Memorial Volume, Humayun Kabir, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1959.

Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan, Dr. S. M. Ikram, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1965, pp. 142-157.

India Wins Freedom, Abul Kalam Azad, Orient Longmans, Calcutta, 1959.

**The Tarjuman ul Quran*, Abul Kalam Azad, English translation by Syed Abdul Latif, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1962.

The erudite author unconvincingly tries to prove the compatibility of the Quran to modern Western theories of evolution and also the alleged validity of all religions as merely

different paths to the same Truth as taught by certain Hindu philosophers.

A Modern Approach to Islam :

**A Modern Approach to Islam*, Asaf A. Fyzee, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963.

Modern Islam in India, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1946.

Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan, Aziz Ahmad, Oxford University Press, London, 1967.

"Islam" Minus Sunnah **: A Critical Analysis of the Work of Ghulam Ahmad Parvez :**

**Islam: A Challenge to Religion*, Ghulam Ahmad Parvez, Idara Tulu-e-Islam, Lahore, 1968.

**Exposition of the Quran* (Urdu), Ghulam Ahmad Parvez, Idara Tulu-e-Islam, Lahore.

An Example of the Influence of Orientalism upon Contemporary Muslim Scholarship :

**Islam*, Fazlur Rahman, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1966.

**Islamic Methodology in History*, Fazlur Rahman, Central Institute of Islamic Research, Karachi, 1965.

Ziya Gokalp : the Forerunner of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk :

**The Foundations of Turkish Nationalism*, Uriel Heyd, Luzac & Co., London, 1950.

**Turkish Nationalism and Western Civilization*, Ziya Gokalp, edited and translated by Niyazi Berkes, Columbia University Press, New York, 1959.

Mustafa Kemal Ataturk : an Appraisal of His Life and Works :

The Emergence of Modern Turkey, Bernard Lewis, Oxford University Press, London, 1961.

**Turkey Today and Tomorrow: An Experiment in Westernization*, Nuri Eren, Pall Mall, London, 1964.

**Conflict of East and West in Turkey*, Halide Edib, Shaikh Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore, 1935.

The Grey Wolf, H. C. Armstrong, Capricorn Books, New York, 1961.

Shaikh Muhammad Abduh :

Tarikh al Ustadh al Imam—Al Shaikh Muhammad Abduh, Rashid Rida, Cairo, 1931-1948.

Muhammad Abduh, Osman Amin, American Council of Learned Societies, Washington D.C., 1953.

Islam and Modernism in Egypt, Charles Adams, Oxford University Press, London, 1933.

Egypt in Search of a Political Community, Nadav Safran, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1961, pp. 62-75.

Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age, Albert Hourani, Oxford University Press, London, 1962, pp. 130-192.

**The Theology of Unity*, Shaikh Muhammad Abduh, English translation by Dr. Kenneth Cragg, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1966.

Qassim Amin and the "Emancipation" of the Muslim Woman :

**Tahrir al-Mar'a* (Woman's Emancipation), Qassim Amin Bey, Cairo, 1899.

**Al-Mar'a Jadida* (The New Woman), Qassim Amin Bey, Cairo, 1900.

Dr. Taha Hussain : the Idol of Egypt's Intelligentsia :

An Egyptian Childhood, Taha Hussain, Paul Routledge & Kegan, London, 1932.

The Stream of Days: A Student at al-Azhar, Taha Hussain, Longmans Green & Co., London, 1948.

**The Future of Culture in Egypt*, Taha Hussain, American Council of Learned Societies, Washington, D.C., 1954.

Shaikh Ali Abd ar-Raziq : the first Alim to Oppose the Khalifate :

**Al-Islam wa Usul al Hukm*, (Islam and the Principles of Government), Ali Abd-ar-Raziq, Cairo, 1925.

The "Islamic" Secularism of Shaikh Khalid Muhammad Khalid :

**From Here We Start*, Khalid Muhammad Khalid, American Council of Learned Societies, Washington D.C., 1953.

Islam and Arab Nationalism :

The Arab Awakening, George Antonius, Lippincott, Philadelphia, 1939.

Arab Nationalism: An Anthology, Sylvia G. Haim, University of California Press, Berkely, 1962.

**The Ideas of Arab Nationalism*, Zaki Hazem Nuseibah, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1956.

"Contemporary Islam and Nationalism: a Case Study of Egypt, Zafar Ishaq Ansari, *The World of Islam*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, Vol. VII, NR. 1-4, 1961, pp. 2-38.

"Religion and Arab Culture," Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *Unesco Journal of World History*, Neuchatel, Switzerland, Vol. XIV, No. 4, 1972, pp. 702-713.

"Islamic" Nationalism :

Nationalism and India, Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, Maktaba-e-Jama'at-e-Islami, Pathankot, May 1947.

Tahreeq-e-Azadi-e-Hind aur Mussalman, Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, Islamic Publications, Lahore, 1968.

This is the best refutation in print of the fallacy of Muslim nationalism as it pertains to the recent history of the Indo-Pak sub-continent just prior to Partition.

**Ideology of Pakistan*, Javid Iqbal, Ferozsons, Ltd., Lahore, 1971.

This book, originally written under the auspices of the late President Ayub Khan by the son of the late Allama Iqbal, unfortunately presents a concept of Islam thoroughly distorted by modernist influences. He presents an utterly erroneous view of the ideal Islamic state he would like to see implemented in Pakistan in which secularism prevails, the tampering of the Shari'ah is allowed to proceed without any restraint, the ulema (or "Mullahs" as he contemptuously calls them), discredited and the mosques and all religious affairs completely controlled by the Government as in Turkey today under the domination of the Kemalist regimes. Javid Iqbal seems to regard the westernizing reforms of Mustafa Kemal Ataturk as his ideal which he wants to see duplicated in Pakistan.

The Dogma of "Progress"—our Deadlies Enemy :

"Progress," Umar Farouq Abdullah, *al-Ittihad*, The Muslim Students Association of the United States and Canada, Winter, 1974, pp. 5-6.

"Man in the Universe: Permanence Amidst Apparent Change," Sayyed Hossein Nasr, *Studies in Comparative Religion*, Middlesex (England), 1968, pp. 244-253.

The Futility of Apologetics—the Cause of our Decay and What Vex must do about it :

Islam in Modern History, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1957, pp. 115-156.

This portion of the book is the most devastating criticism of Muslim modernist apologetic literature by an orientalist known to me.

Why Modernism Must Fail !

Come Let us Change This World, Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, translated and edited by Kaukab Siddique, the Islamic Party of North America, Washington D.C., 1972.

A handbook for Islamic Revolution.

The Process of Islamic Revolution, Sayyid Abul Ala Maudoodi, Islamic Publications, Lahore, 1947.

First delivered as a lecture to the students of Aligarh University in 1940, this is the most inspiring booklet on how to counter the influences of the modernists and establish a genuine Islamic order.

Appendix :

The Pakistan Times, Lahore.

*These are the most important classics of Muslim modernism. They belong on the "black-list" and should be approached with extreme caution because they have all done (intentionally or unintentionally) irreparable harm to the Islamic cause.

MARYAM JAMEELAH'S THOUGHT-PROVOKING BOOKS ON ISLAM

1976

1. Islam Versus the West.
2. Islam and Modernism.
3. Islam in Theory and Practice.
4. Islam Versus Ahl al Kitab-Past and Present.
5. Ahmad Khalil.
6. Islam and Orientalism.
7. Western Civilization Condemned by itself.
8. Correspondence Between Maulana Maudoodi and Maryam Jameelah.
9. Islam and Western Society.
10. A Manifesto of the Islamic Movement.
11. Is Western Civilization Universal ?
12. Who is Maudoodi ?
13. Why I Embraced Islam.
14. Islam and the Muslim Woman Today.
15. Islam and Our Social Habits.
16. Islamic Culture in Theory and Practice.
17. Three Great Islamic Movements in the Arab World of the Recent Past.
18. Shaikh Hassan al Banna and Al Ikhwan al Muslimun.
19. A Great Islamic Movement in Turkey.
20. Two Mujahidin of the Recent Past and their Struggle for Freedom Against Foreign Rule.
21. The Generation Gap. Its Causes and Consequences.
22. Westernization Versus Muslims.
23. Westernization and Human Welfare.
24. Modern Technology and the Dehumanization of Man.
25. Islam and Modern Man.

PUBLISHERS

Mohammad Yusuf Khan & Sons

Sunnat (Sant) Nagar, Lahore (Pakistan)